020.715
A434
no.11-13
1964-67
cop.3

020.715
A 434
no. 11
cop. 3

UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

Allerton Park Institute

THE LIBRARY OF THE

The person charging this material is responsible for its return on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

University of Illinois Library

AUG 22 1969

ALI

MAR 19 1970

APR 23 1970

JUN - 1 1970

MAY 20 1983

L161— O-1096

UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

Papers presented at an Institute
conducted by the
University of Illinois
Graduate School of Library Science

November 1 - 4, 1964

Edited by
Rolland E. Stevens

Distributed by
The Illini Union Bookstore
Champaign, Illinois

Copyright © 1965 by
The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois

Lithographed in U.S.A. by
EDWARDS BROTHERS, INC.
Ann Arbor, Michigan

FOREWORD

Archival administration has been paid scant attention by librarians and by teachers of library science. In spite of its resemblance, at least in externals, to the management of libraries, it has been the historians who first appreciated the value of archives and who developed principles and methods for their administration. Recognition by librarians of this important kindred study is long overdue. There are signs that in our universities we are emerging from the stage in which the task of preserving and arranging the past records of the institutions is given to a semi-retired professor of Greek or medieval history.

For its 11th Allerton Park Institute, therefore, the faculty of the Graduate School of Library Science of the University of Illinois chose the topic, "University Archives." The task of dividing the topic into convenient parts, securing speakers, inviting participants, and attending to the many details of a conference fell to a Planning Committee of the School's faculty: Mr. Robert B. Downs, Miss Thelma Eaton, Mr. Herbert Goldhor, and the editor. Happily, the Committee was able to get the advice and help of Mr. Maynard Brichford, Archivist of the University of Illinois. The suitable division of the topic and the securing of able persons to participate in the program largely followed his suggestions, since he was much better acquainted with both the subject and the leaders of the field than were the members of the Committee. With his counsel, the Committee feels that some of the ablest archivists in the United States were invited to take part on the program. Their acceptance of assignments and their willingness to take time from their heavy programs to prepare and deliver papers at the Conference resulted almost entirely from a desire to further the recognition of the profession of archival management, particularly when that recognition came from the sister discipline of library science.

If the sharing of mutual interests by these two professions is overdue, it may be hoped that this Allerton Park Institute at least fostered a friendship. Most of the conferees were university librarians whose duties now, or soon will, include the management of their institution's archives. Not only did they show great interest and ask many questions in the meetings, but generally they also indicated some surprise at the degree of independent development of this kindred field and at the difference between the principles governing the management of archives and those with which they were already familiar.

At the final session of the conference, Mr. Brichford asked for opinions about the need for training future archivists. In his report of this session, he noted that:

> The participants agreed 1) on the need for special training for university or "small" archivists, 2) that the training should include formal training in archival theory and practical work with materials, and 3) that Library School students need some archival training, if only to enable them to distinguish archival material. They did not agree on the type of training, but suggested three possibilities:
>
> 1 - a series of training institutes like the Allerton sessions with emphasis on work with archival materials—similar to the American University—National Archives courses.
>
> 2 - an elective course or courses in a Library School.
>
> 3 - a special curriculum in the Library School with courses in historical research methods, public administration, archival principles and techniques and library science.
>
> Most archivists are dissatisfied with the existing training and there is an increasing demand for archivists. The main problem is that a competent archivist needs an interest in research, a graduate degree in history and practical work experience. Short courses and electives provide training, but do not equip one without this background to manage an archival program.

Besides the counsel of Mr. Brichford, the Planning Committee wishes to acknowledge also the help of the following persons in making the conference a success and in bringing the papers to published form: Mr. Eugene H. Schroth, Allerton House; Mr. Hugh M. Davison, Division of University Extension; Mrs. Ruth Spence, Library School Library; and Mrs. Bonnie Noble and Miss Jean Somers, Graduate School of Library Science. While many of the advantages of attending the conference cannot be made available to those who are able only to read the published papers, nevertheless it is our hope that readers of this volume will find ideas and methods which they may apply at their institutions.

Rolland E. Stevens
Chairman, Planning Committee

Urbana, Illinois
November 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD v

HISTORY AND THEORY OF ARCHIVAL PRACTICE
Oliver W. Holmes 1

ORGANIZING, STAFFING AND EQUIPPING A UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES PROGRAM
*J. E. Boell . . . . .

RECORDS MANAGEMENT
Thornton W. Mitchell 22

THE COLLECTING OF ARCHIVAL MATERIALS AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY
Edith M. Fox 36

APPRAISAL AND PROCESSING
Maynard Brichford 46

CONSERVATION
Harold W. Tribolet 62

THE REFERENCE USE OF ARCHIVES
Clifford K. Shipton 68

A SCHOLAR'S VIEW OF UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
Laurence R. Veysey 82

*We regret that Mr. Boell's manuscript did not arrive in time for inclusion in this publication.

HISTORY AND THEORY OF ARCHIVAL PRACTICE

Oliver W. Holmes

Knowledge exists in two forms: (1) "active knowledge," meaning that to be found in the brains of living human individuals and therefore available to them at any given moment as bases for actions, and (2) "passive (or potential) knowledge," which exists in the great reservoir of documents in which have been recorded the experiences, observations, thoughts, and discoveries of other men, chiefly those of the past.

Human progress has paralleled and, seemingly, been dependent upon the growth and availability of this great reservoir of "passive knowledge." The human race is believed to have existed for hundreds of thousands of years on this planet with much the same physical and mental capacities as today, but civilization, as we think of it, dawned only between 5,000 and 6,000 years ago, and, seemingly was made possible by the invention of writing. It was writing that first preserved records through time and permitted the beginning of a reservoir of passive knowledge. Until then a man had only his own observations and experiences to guide him or at most traditions going back a few generations and limited in place to a small neighborhood. Each generation, instead of standing on the shoulders of previous generations, almost had to begin all over again. Only through the invention of writing did it become possible to pass along from generation to generation an ever accumulating body of passive knowledge from which man can draw when necessary to increase the body of active knowledge at his command.

The custody of this great, and ever increasing, reservoir of passive knowledge is the responsibility of the archivist and the librarian. They must preserve it safely and impartially, and they must ever seek better ways to make it increasingly available to mankind so that it becomes part of the active knowledge by which they are guided.

Instead of the two terms "archivist" and "librarian," there should be a single word to designate these priests because this greatest treasure of mankind for which they have responsibility is an indivisible whole. There are differences between archives and the normal holdings of libraries, which call for differences in adminis-

---

The author is Executive Director, National Historical Publications Commission, Washington, D. C.

tration, but the two are complementary parts of this vast reservoir of passive knowledge and should not be too completely divorced. Each helps to interpret the other, and the priests should be knowledgeable about both.

The word "archives," although very old on the European continent, is relatively foreign to the English language where the word "records" has always meant much the same thing both in common law and in common parlance. The foreign word was beginning to be used early in the nineteenth century by self-conscious scholars, especially historians, to refer to old records seemingly preserved for their special benefit. One cannot help feeling this usage of the term was in a way associated with the Romantic movement in its first appearance both in England and in America. Its more frequent usage later in the century can be traced to the influence of history scholars returning from the seminars of Leopold von Ranke and his students at German universities. But the common, every-day working term in the English language continued to be "records." The terminology of the archival profession in English is still unstable among those who consider themselves professionals, and of course there is even more confusion in the layman's mind—and all working in this area must be constantly aware of this confusion.

The words "record," or "records," in early English law, and today, have the sense of a writing or documents deliberately preserved, and often deliberately created, to transmit a message in time (Latin-recordari; to be mindful of, or to remember). Writings also preserved unintentionally become records in time. Records, therefore, are documents recording what has taken place. The action is over. Any document becomes a record if it is preserved after the event.

Records deliberately created and preserved by an office, an agency, or an organization (or less common, and less accepted, by a family or an individual) are its archives. Not all records "created" by an office or agency become part of its archives. The definition says "created and preserved by." All offices, agencies, and other record-creating organizations produce records, such as outgoing letters, commissions, orders, et cetera, which they properly send out or distribute to others. These may or may not become parts of other archival bodies. They are part of the archives of the creating agency only when found in the form of "record-copies" that it has deliberately preserved. Also, an office or organization may receive communications and other writings that it does not preserve—that is, consciously file as a record for future reference. These usually go out as waste paper. In other words, an agency's archives are those documents deemed worth keeping or filing for possible future use.

Archives may be categorized or classified in terms of their creating agencies. Thus we have:

1. Public archives or public records—those created by federal, state, and local governing bodies. Only since we have had democratic governments—deriving their powers from the governed—have these been public records in the sense of belonging to the people, that is, of being publicly owned, as well as in the sense of being open and accessible to the public for reference. Under monarchical government they belonged to the king, but he might by his grace make some of them "public records" in the sense that his subjects were given the right to see them. The term came into use in this sense in Medieval England with respect to records of the king's courts, but was by no means applicable to the administrative records of other governing bodies of the Crown.

2. Institutional and organizational archives (often semi-public). These may include the records of political parties, patriotic societies, clubs, charitable institutions or organizations, learned societies, foundations, non-profit corporations, and the like. Especially important categories, having a long history, are the archives of: (a) churches and religious organizations; and (b) educational institutions, particularly colleges and universities.

3. Business archives—that is, the records of corporations and unincorporated businesses. Usually private, they may be affected with a public interest, especially when in such a category as public utilities. These may also, of course, include mutual and cooperative business organizations.

4. Family and personal archives—wholly private in character. Some assemblages of these may have the characteristics of archival bodies and should be handled and administered as such. Others, however, are isolated or selected documents not preserved in any special order or they have lost such order as they might once have been given. Often families have mixed them hopelessly or picked them over before releasing them, and they are better thought of as family or personal "papers."

This leads us to one of the basic characteristics of archives, their special relationship to their creator. They are the documents of some creating agency and have a special meaning because of that fact. A second characteristic is that they were created in the course of official business, so to speak. Their purpose was to get things done, and they were saved as the record of what was done. A third characteristic is that they have (or had) a special order established by their creator for his own purposes, and, when preserved in that order, they are revealing of those purposes. Each document is given, and later exhibits, a relationship to all the others that is meaningful and that can be easily obscured or lost if this order is tampered with. A final characteristic is that all of these documents are thus tied into one complete set or body that is unique and possesses a kind of "organic" character, a whole which has a meaning different

from and greater than the sum of its parts. This archival body is known by various terms in different languages; but in French, one of the most influential languages in matters archival, it is referred to as the fonds. We often use this term in English because we have no really satisfactory equivalent. The terms "archive group," used at the British Public Record Office, and "record group," used at National Archives in Washington and elsewhere in America, may refer to the same natural body but often refer to larger divisions of holdings more arbitrarily bounded for administrative convenience.

Out of the basic characteristics just enumerated, several famous archival principles of arrangement are derived. First, the archives of a given archival creating agency must not be intermingled with those of other creating agencies. This is the principle called by the French respect des fonds, meaning a respect for the natural body of documentation left by a creating agency and reflecting its work. Keep it just that. Do not let documents drift away from it. Do not let alien documents get into it.

The second principle is that the archival accumulation of the creating agency should be retained in its original organization pattern or structure, that is, the pattern of arrangement reflecting its growth and its use when still a live, active organism, so to speak. This is the principle of the sanctity of the original order (l'ordre primitif). The two principles together add up to the principle of provenience (provenance) in its complete sense although this term can be misleading, when, as is often the case, it is used as the equivalent of only the first of these principles, that is, respect des fonds. Maintaining a body of archives according to these principles is what we mean when we talk about respecting "archival integrity."

The second of these principles, the sanctity of the original order, since it goes a step further than merely respect for the fonds, is the most difficult of the two to carry into execution. Often a body of records has been so tampered with that the original order is obscured and its restoration, if not impossible, is difficult and time-consuming. There is a temptation to rearrange the documents according to some other principle, which, if the new principle can be agreed upon (not always an easy matter), is also a difficult and time-consuming, and therefore expensive, operation. When the original order is completely lost, such rearrangement becomes necessary, but this is very rarely the case. If it is unavoidable, it will be accepted reluctantly and with the full realization that, although composed of the same documents (the same molecules, so to speak) one has a new and different body of records with new meanings brought out by the new relationships, but with many of the old meanings lost forever.

It is sometimes argued that the interests of this generation, which may be entirely different from the interests of those who

created the records, should have precedence, and that in such a case the records should be rearranged in whatever order might seem best suited to serve current interests. But the interests of the next generation might change; and the interests of any generation are not single. One will find many conflicting interests and to decide on the overriding one at any one time will prove to be difficult. Some will demand the chronological approach, others a geographical approach, and still others some topical approach. It is my belief that these and all other approaches can best be served by rearrangements on paper in the form of finding aids—calendars, subject indexes, and special lists of different kinds. One cannot be sure, but it is possible, that modern information retrieval systems may make possible great variety in approaches to a body of archival material. The cost of putting the information into the machine will not be a small cost, you may be sure, but neither is the cost of rearranging a body of records according to some arbitrary principle which henceforth makes easy only one approach and discourages all others. My main point is that these rearrangements on arbitrary principles are always possible later if by experience they prove necessary, whereas the arrangement according to the provenance principle once lost cannot be retrieved by machines or humans. The custodian has thrown away, almost as though the records were destroyed, the unique insights offered by the way in which the creating agency grouped and filed the documents as it acted upon them.

Others will need to carry further the consideration of these general principles and their application in the field of "University Archives." They have been dealt with here because they throw light on the nature of archives as over against collected informational materials, chiefly printed, which are the traditional responsibility of the librarian. It appears that these areas of responsibility can be more sharply separated in theory than they usually are in practice, and that together they make up the whole of recorded experience which constitutes the growing reservoir of passive knowledge to be available whenever needed in the service of mankind.

The history of archives and archives administration is important for archivists, chiefly because it helps them to fix their present position in the development of their profession and thus to chart their course for the future with greater confidence. If I seem to you to start further back than is necessary, I would answer that the archivist must take the long view. His work is for the ages to come and it helps him to know what past ages and past archivists have done for and against the records of the past.

The first writings appear to have been records; in fact, the need to keep records appears to have led to the development of writing. Our earliest writings are records kept in the temples and in the courts of the rulers. Priests and kings were closely related

in antiquity, and in some cases king and priest were one and court and temple were one. Inventories had to be kept of the ruler's property—his men, his weapons, his stock of supplies. Records had to be kept of offerings made or taxes (usually in kind) collected. It was easy to draw a picture of most of these things and to make marks beside them for the number. This picture writing tended to become conventionalized into signs that stood for the words for the things counted. Supplementary signs were soon invented to stand for verbs and adjectives. The further back one gets in any preserved form of writing the more likely it is to be of this nature. It is well illustrated in the contents of the recently deciphered Linear B tablets, the earliest examples of efforts to write the Greek language. Only the initiates in the kings' courts or in the temples would be able to interpret these scratchings but as older ones taught the younger ones, records could be preserved across time and deciphered and the reservoir of passive knowledge, restricted as it was, came into being.

Writing was not invented as a vehicle for poetry or story telling. The old stories and songs were kept alive across the generations by mnemones ("remembrancers"), to use the Greek word for an official that existed in almost all early preliterate societies. It was only after writing had developed to a very high level indeed that these songs and stories, as in the example of Homer, could be captured by the written word and thus incorporated into the reservoir of written knowledge.

One would expect the earliest preserved writings, consequently, to be associated with kings' palaces and temples and to be archival in character, and so they are. They are the clay tablets of Assyria, Babylonia, and the Hittite Empire from the 3rd millenium B.C. to the Christian Era. As better-known examples may be mentioned:

1. The Temple Archives of Nippur.—This classic Sumerian site was excavated first by the University of Pennsylvania Museum, beginning in 1887. Excavations were renewed in 1947, and additional tablets are still being discovered. There are now over 54,000 tablets, but tens of thousands of clay tablets discovered in the 1890's are still being deciphered.

2. The Mari Tablets from the Palace of Zimri-Lim.—More than 20,000 tablets were discovered by French expeditions, 1930-1946. They include an eighteenth century B.C. diplomatic correspondence of much historical significance found in what was a sort of chancery room. Many tablets of economic import were discovered in other rooms where accounting records were found divided according to their subject matter.

3. The Boghazekeui Archives, 1500-1200 B.C., from the old Hittite capital.—Most of the texts came from the royal archives and

were central in bringing out of obscurity the whole story of the Hittite empire.

4. The Tel-el-Amarna Letters.—The first diplomatic archives to be discovered, these clay tablets were at first a puzzle because found in Egypt, which was not a clay tablet country. They proved to be over 300 incoming letters from kings of clay tablet countries of western Asia to the Emperor Ikhnaton, written a little after 1500 B.C., and were part of the royal archives at Amarna. The story of their dispersal by antiquities dealers and the long, persistent efforts by scholars, after their importance was realized, to locate these tablets or fragments of tablets and restore their contents on paper is an interesting parallel to the dispersal by dealers of modern archival fonds or natural accumulations of private papers.

Clay tablets were also found associated with the Minoan civilization of the Agean, first early in this century when quantities were discovered by Sir Arthur Evans in his excavations of the palace of Minos in Crete, but more recently also on the Greek mainland, notably in excavations on the west shores of the Peloponnesus of the palace of Nestor by Carl Blegen, where he designated one room the "archives room" because of the great number of tablets found there. These tablets curiously were incised with a linear script instead of the ubiquitous cuneiform, or wedge-shaped, writing of the civilizations further east. A surprising discovery, when these tablets were recently deciphered, was that the language was Greek, thus giving us Greek writing more than 500 years earlier than any known hitherto and revolutionizing the interpretation of the Minoan age. One might wish the Greeks had continued to place their records on clay tablets. One does not know why this writing disappears suddenly, but evidences point to invasions which ushered in a dark age lasting a half century. It is believed the Greeks began once more to keep written records about 750 B.C., but these early writings on less permanent writing materials have disappeared.

One could multiply these illustrations. The discoveries of these archival bodies have represented major advances in the recovery of antiquity--they contribute far more than unrelated fragments. Clay tablets are difficult to destroy in dry climates, and so we have the contents even of waste baskets, disposed of supposedly by being thrown over the side of the mound--more documentation by far for the 2,000 years before Christ than for the 1,000 years after the downfall of the Roman Empire. We have governmental records, religious records, educational records (the temples were the schools for the scribes, and we have even the clay tablets that represent their exercise books), business records, and family records. The clay tablet period teaches us one of our basic lessons, the importance of a permanent base upon which the message is placed if the records are to be preserved for the millenia to come. Also, archeologists

like archivists have learned the importance of provenance. An isolated clay tablet, deprived of its background and associations, has lost much of its message. But the message that is left is less confusing if the tablet remains alone than when it is arbitrarily associated with other tablets under some artificial classification system.

During the classical period of Greece, writings were on white wooden tablets or on papyrus, which was imported from Egypt, or, later, on parchment. Much is known about the keeping of archives in ancient Greece, but the archives themselves, in contrast to those of the clay tablet civilizations, have not survived because they were on an impermanent base. A less dry climate than the desert civilizations may have been a factor, but the chief cause of their destruction appears to have been fire. A conflagration baked the clay tablets harder, but wood and paper invited total consumption. There are records of many fires and some were doubtless deliberately set by the barbaric invaders who were to destroy so much of our heritage from both Greece and Rome.

It is known that the records of the city-state of Athens were kept in the Metrōōn—the Temple of the Mother of the Gods—in the Agora. The sacred character of these records in Greek eyes is symbolized by their being placed under the special care of their mother goddess. These were the originals. Copies of these wooden tablets were often set up in public places where they could be consulted by all citizens, and this in ancient days was the usual form of publication. More permanent laws and constitutions might in rare instances be carved or chiseled in stone.

Much of our knowledge of Greek history is known not from records found in Greece but to papyri recovered from the sands of Egypt. The use of the fibers of the papyrus plant as a base for writing began very early in the Nile Valley, but papyri containing the ancient hieroglyphic writings are relatively rare. Most of the papyri recovered from Egypt date from the period when the Greek language was dominant. In them are preserved many Greek classics, some of which would otherwise be lost. Non-literary papyri, however, form much the greater portion of the material recovered, and much of it is archival in character and content—laws, edicts, judicial proceedings, official correspondence, tax lists, and inventories. Papyri documents have not been found in extensive related bodies so frequently as have the clay tablets. Possibly they have been more scattered by dealers in antiquities, for many became available to Western scholars through their hands in the last century before there was the great concern for details of provenance that exists today. However, each piece—usually in roll form—is generally a longer document than are those found on clay tablets. Papyrus became a popular writing material north of the Mediterranean as well as south

of it, probably because it was easier to prepare than parchment and lighter and less awkward than were wooden tablets. It continued to be used in Greece and Rome down into the eleventh and twelfth centuries, longer than in Egypt where after 900 A.D. paper, introduced by the Arabs, became more common. Few papyri survived, however, in the area north of the Mediterranean. A damper climate, fires, and deliberate destruction by invaders were the reasons. Survival in Egypt of this destructible writing material can be attributed mainly to the dry climate, and thus the important role played by climate conditions in the preservation of records over the ages is again emphasized.

Record keeping in antiquity probably reached its height in Roman Egypt. It made use of record keeping practices imported from both Greece and Rome but also, and perhaps more important, inherited others from a still more ancient Egypt and from the Persian Empire and its successors of the Hellenistic age, which in turn had learned from the clay tablet civilizations that preceded them. Happily also, because so many papyri have been preserved, we are well informed about Roman Egypt's record offices and their highly developed practices.

In Roman Egypt there was located at the capital of every nome or province a central record (the demosia bibliotheke) in which the various officials were required to deposit their records, or copies of them. These housed the census records, the land surveys, the tax rolls, the official diaries (each higher official, from the prefect down, was required to keep a daybook of official transactions, open to public inspection), and the like. Official correspondence received was made up into composite rolls, the individual sheets of papyrus being fastened together; so also were the documents handed in by the public. All these rolls were preserved and numbered, and there were serial numbers, like page numbers, distinguishing the columns on each roll, so that reference was easy from registers also kept of the receipt of these documents. These offices were administered by bibliophylakes, which you may translate either as archivist or librarian. They were the keepers of the books. A modern archivist, seemingly, would have found himself at home among these records.

Alexandria, the capital of Egypt, had its central Bibliotheke, to which were sent copies of the official diaries of the governors in all the nomes, thus providing a security copy as well as a means for close supervision. Also fully developed in Egypt was the notarial system, which also existed earlier both in Greece and in the clay tablet countries. Again in each nome is found an official responsible for the operation of the system in that nome, but in each major village is found a grapheion, a place where contracts were drawn up and executed, and where a file of these was kept open for inspection.

These public contracts had greater standing than contracts made between parties unofficially and not made public. Private contracts could be given a degree of legal standing, if wished, by registration in which case the contents would be summarized but not revealed in whole. The Romans in all provinces encouraged "publication" of contracts by full recording and discouraged private deeds and contracts but never wholly invalidated the latter. Both parties to a contract were given copies of the original. The originals were made up into rolls and the rolls numbered. A register (anagraphe) of all contracts, in chronological order, was kept on other roles. A notable body of papyri at the University of Michigan includes the archives of such an office (the combined grapheion of two villages named Tebtunis and Kirkesouche Oros) in which these practices were illustrated. This notarial system, which became general in the Mediterranean world, is still a basic feature of all Latin countries in the Old World and in the New. The practices were illustrated again in old Vincennes and in Cahokia and Kaskaskia; and how lawyers trained in the English tradition did wrestle with the problems offered by these records when we took over New Orleans!

Note use of the Greek form biblio (book) as applied to all writings in roll form and theke (repository) as the term for library or archives, whichever you wish to consider it, for there appeared to be no division or distinction between these two in all antiquity. Some repositories might hold rolls of archival character almost entirely, and others contain more rolls of literary character, especially if some scholar or custodian were interested in collecting them, but the physical contents looked alike, and our application backward of the modern terms implies a distinction that had little validity before the invention or printing.

This picture of Roman record keeping at the provincial and local levels has been discussed at some length because record keeping practices did not reach this stage of development again until perhaps the sixteenth century, and when they were reviewed it was surprising how the old patterns had persisted. Greeks, and, later, Arabs brought them into Sicily, that crossroads of the Middle Ages, and from there they were spread northward by the Norman kings and the German emperors who successively ruled Sicily.

In Rome itself the first special building for the public records was erected at the end of the Forum under the protection of the temple of Saturn, as early as 509 B.C. It was intended especially as a place where the people could consult the laws. Most of the older records of the Republic are supposed to have perished in the burning of Rome by the Gauls in 309 B.C. Other buildings served in the interim before the building in 78 B.C. of the great Tabularium, a most impressive archives building that closed the west end of the

Forum, just below the Temple of Jupiter, which temple was the symbol of the sovereignty and power of Rome. Parts of the great Tabularium still survive, having been incorporated by Michelangelo into the present Palazzo del Senatore. There were other tabularia in the city of Rome and tabularia in most of the provinces, which held the tabulae publicae, the public documents of the governing bodies. Roman record keeping reached its zenith in the later Empire after the administrative reforms of Diocletian about 300 A.D. An elaborate bureaucracy developed, organized into bureaus or officia, for our words "office" and "official" originated in this period.

Again, we do not have the actual records of the central administration of the Roman Empire, and we know of the ways and places in which they were kept only from non-archival writings of Roman leaders and from vestiges of their practices as they survived in the Papal Chancery. For, while record keeping at local level survived through Egypt and Sicily, as has already been described, it was the Papal Chancery that served as the link between the ancient and modern world in administrative organization, procedures, and record keeping at the top level. The Apostolic Court was organized from the first on the model of the Roman Imperial Court. It grew up under its shadow. Its offices paralleled those of the Diocletian Empire. Many churchmen and some Popes had served in their earlier life, before becoming monks, as officials of the empire, notably Pope Gregory the Great, 590-604, who made the papacy a political as well as a religious power. Gregory had served as Prefect of Rome before entering the service of the Church.

The barbarian kingdoms arising on the ruins of the Roman Empire in the West copied more or less intelligently the Roman model, now best represented by the Church. This copying was almost inevitable because of their dependence on clerics (thus our word "clerks") for writing, for, once north of Italy, clerics were almost the only persons knowledgeable in this art. The chancery of the Merovingian kings is the best example of this. After the alliance of Clovis with the Church about 496, he was helped by church officials especially with chancery matters. The some ninety authentic Merovingian diplomas or charters that survive from successor Merovingian kings have the character of papal charters. The older originals are written on papyrus, vellum coming in toward the end of the seventh century.

We have more such documentation for Charlemagne's rule than for any other in the Middle Ages. His chancery was wholly staffed by court chaplains and clerics, and logically, the archives were kept in the royal chapel. Charlemagne's son and successor, Louis the Pious, appointed a bishop as his arch chancellor, and bishops continued to hold office through the Carolingian period and earlier centuries of

the Capetian kings, gaining more and more practical influence in the administration. As the King's chief secretary, the chancellor handled appeals and petitions of aggrieved persons (the beginnings of his judicial functions) as well as the King's political correspondence. Charlemagne established his palace school to train men to do this work and called in monks from as far as Italy and England to staff it.

Aside from the courts of the kings and emperors, almost the only writing throughout the Middle Ages was in the churches and the monasteries. They served:

1. As centers for the multiplying of copies for use in a day when copies were made only by hand. This was a major function of the scriptorium found in almost all monasteries.

2. As archival depositories not only for religious writings but for records of kings and princes, who deposited them in these sanctified places for security in times of uncertainty.

3. As creators of administrative records of their own. Almost the only surviving records of real estate and business transactions for the Middle Ages are those of monasteries. Almost the only notations of contemporary events are the monastic annals and chronicles, meagre as they are.

It is to the churches and the monasteries as the chief places of refuge against the fury and neglect of the Middle Ages that we owe the preservation of most medieval documents, and, as has been stated, they are few as compared with those that have survived from antiquity.

Medieval documents are scarce not just because of the ravages of time but because few were created in the first place. Why?

1. Illiteracy was so widespread few could make records, and there was not much point to making them when few could read.

2. It was an age of oral government, of the use of rituals and ceremonies that were to be witnessed by the people, as a substitute for written records. Laws and edicts were published by proclamation. Federal courts operated without written law which had almost ceased to exist. Trials, often by ordeal, and punishments were open so that the people could actually see justice being carried out. The ceremonial conveyance of lands by livery of seisin and "beating the bounds" periodically to preserve the memory of boundaries are further examples that even carried over into the colonial period of our own country.

3. Material to write upon (chiefly parchment) was scarce and expensive, and therefore reserved for only the most important things, in those days mostly things religious. Old writings were erased to make way for the new; thus the palimpsest. Paper was exceedingly scarce until the sixteenth century. Early mills were very small and the trade secrets were jealously guarded until the invention of printing so raised the demand that monopolies were broken down.

4. Business transactions, which produce such quantities of modern records, were fewer because of the general self-sufficiency of communities, and were rarely recorded because they were usually mere exchanges in kind made locally between neighbors.

The reservoir of passive knowledge built up by the civilizations of antiquity had been almost overwhelmed by the barbarian way of life, which knew only the ways of living traditional to a people depending wholly on active knowledge.

But enough passive knowledge survived to begin the reversal, and there were powerful influences that worked to accelerate it, once begun. Some of these influences were:

1. The need for writing to harmonize conflicting customs and traditions or deliberately to choose between them. This began with the capitularies of Charlemagne's time and triumphed with the revival of Roman law in Bologna in the twelfth century, which led to reappraisal of principles and practices brought in by non-Roman sources and to the compilation of new codes, which led in turn to written arguments and the recording of written decisions in the king's courts.

2. The need to transmit actions taken in oral ceremony through time to future generations, first to facilitate confirmations by succeeding rulers, and, later, to avoid need of confirmations with each change in sovereigns, in other words, to give stability to society. The keeping of copies of charters given by the king also guarded against forgeries, which were not uncommon in the Middle Ages. This was the origin of the patent rolls in England. These contained the documents that were intended to be open to the public, that is "patent" and so we have our many kinds of "patent" documents today. Copies of the king's private correspondence began to be kept also. These became the "close" rolls. Thus the body of passive knowledge at the Court began to grow. No longer were the kings able to carry their records around with them in chests as they traveled from one part of the kingdom to another with their traveling court. They began to leave some behind in a chapel or fortress, especially those created by their predecessors that they no longer needed so close at hand.

3. The rise of the towns in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, almost more than any other movement, marks the passing of the Middle Ages. As they gained freedom from feudal jurisdiction, they developed their own government, including courts, markets, and mints, and of necessity created and preserved in their town hall their own records, beginning with their town charter. Many famous city archives in Europe go back to the later Middle Ages, 1200-1500.

4. The practice of keeping notarial records revived, beginning in Italy in the twelfth century. Once revived it spread rapidly. Notaries were needed to make and keep contracts and other records for ordinary people not yet able to make and keep them for them-

selves. Many kept in Italy, France, and Spain in the fourteenth century are preserved. They begin to furnish a valuable picture of the life of the people in contrast to that of Church and Court.

5. With the rise of trade and banking operations, the written record began to invade non-government fields. The late twelfth century saw the first bills of exchange, letters of credit, and other negotiable instruments. Bookkeeping, absent from western Europe since the seventh century, had been preserved in the East and was reintroduced by Italian merchants with Arabic numbers in the twelfth century and spread northward with trade. Insurance on merchandise and marine risks appears in the late fourteenth century. Private banking begins to play its role in northern Italy and also expands to the northward largely through close-knit family connections. And so we have our first surviving private business records since antiquity dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The Trésor des Chartes, used by successive French kings to carry their valuable charters with them from place to place for 300 years finally came to rest in the new Sainte Chapelle completed in 1248 on the Isle de la Cité in Paris, being entrusted again to a religious sanctuary in what was now to become the French capital city. This may symbolize the end of the ambulatory period for the archives of the monarchs of that day although Henry VII was still to take his archives along on his coronation journey into Italy in 1310, where they were stranded at his death. They are still to be found in great part at Pisa and Turin. The French kings added to their Trésor in the chapel from time to time until 1568, the date of the latest accession. The contents of the Trésor des Chartes were afterwards kept intact to and through the Revolution and then transferred to the newly established Archives Nationales, where they are maintained as a separate closed fonds to the present day. In similar fashion, as the residences of other monarchs and their courts became more settled, stationary archival depositories came into existence at these newly established capital cities.

The story now, so far as governmental archives are concerned, is the rise again of bureaucracy in the ministries that grew up under the absolute monarchs of Europe of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and of consequent greater creation of and dependance upon records. Expansion of the central government's services was accompanied by increasing responsibility for field services as the monarchs struggled to break the local rule of the feudal aristocracy, marked, for example, in France by the intendant system. This movement is accompanied by the rise of the paid professional civil servant instead of officials owning their offices by inheritance or purchase of some forgotten feudal right to them. These professional administrators tended to depend more and more on

records for precedent and for systematic and impartial administration of taxes, justice, lands, and natural resources. They systematized the keeping of records. There was an increased use of the mails which also led to increased documentation. This period marks the rapid expansion of the registry system about which much was written at the time. This is the period that needs to be studied if we are to understand the record systems introduced into our own government at the time of its beginnings.

But the records of government still belonged to the king and not to the people. In the new United States, it is true, the people theoretically took control of their own in 1776, but in Europe it remained for the French Revolution to establish the principal that the records belonged to the citizens of a republic. The responsibility of a State for preserving these records as the peoples' heritage, and for making them accessible to the people was set forth in the law of June 25, 1794. This law turned the archives established by the French Assembly for its own records into a central archival depository of the Republic, the present Archives Nationales. Subordinated to the Archives Nationales in 1796 were the newly established records in each of the recently established départements, the first instance of a state-wide archives system centrally directed.

This is not the place to pursue the story of the French archives in the nineteenth century, but the patterns of thinking and organization set in motion by the Revolutionary government were followed by other European countries that came within the French orbit, notably, Belgium, The Netherlands, the Kingdom of Naples, and a number of other Italian states.

In England, Sweden, Prussia, and Denmark, on the other hand, central archival establishments evolved out of existing chancery or ministerial archives. The nineteenth century saw the victory of the idea of a special public archives service to preserve and administer a nation's archival heritage. Today there are in Europe central archival establishments for all national governments. There are also a vast number of provincial archives, municipal archives, and archives for other units of local government, which may or may not be under the close control of a centralized national archival administration, in this respect reflecting the degree of centralization or decentralization of a government generally. In addition to serving an administrative purpose, these archival agencies began more and more in the early nineteenth century to serve scholarship as well. At first legal considerations, that is the rights of the people as set forth in the records, appear to have motivated revolutionary governments in opening the archives to their citizens. But the enormous masses of records of the old regimes that became available in these depositories turned them into "mines" for historical scholars. Increasing national consciousness brought increasing use of the records of a nation's

past in writing its history. This trend was further accelerated by the rise in Germany and rapid spread elsewhere of the school of scientific history, with its emphasis upon the primacy of documents in the study and interpretation of the past.

In the nineteenth century, historians came to dominate in the administration of European archives to such a degree that there was a tendency in archives administration to concentrate their efforts and resources on the records of the old regimes, and the facilitating of research in them, to the neglect of other administrative functions and the maintenance of meaningful relationships with current governments. This academic emphasis continued well into the twentieth century. There has now been in progress for some time a movement away from this limiting tradition, which movement is in different stages of progress in different countries. Most of the archival establishments of the Latin American countries were founded when the historical tradition was uppermost, with the result that, as a rule, they are concerned primarily with the records of the colonial and wars of independence periods and have in custody few, if any, records of their national periods. Their holdings tend to be static in character. The Public Records Office of Canada, founded in 1871, was in somewhat the same position in the years before World War II, but has moved rapidly forward in recent years.

In the United States the idea of centralized custody of noncurrent public records, as brought back by scholars returning from their education and research experiences in the European continent, was colored by the historical tradition still dominant in many continental institutions. Historians especially thought of archival establishments mainly in terms of centralized repositories of available materials for research. Those state archival agencies that were established in the earlier years of this century tended to be closely associated with or auxiliary to state historical departments or divisions (or in the Midwest to the state historical societies, which are there state supported rather than private organizations). The development of many of these archival agencies into broader spheres of usefulness to the government that supports them has often been handicapped by this association. The archives program has too often tended to be thought of as just another service to history squeezed in by these busy organizations.

The National Archives in Washington stands on a broader foundation and symbolizes the union of the cultural and administrative traditions in archival administration and service. Most of the credit for its establishment must be given to the promotional work of historians and scholars generally, many of them still acting in the current of the historical tradition that has been described. But there was also a strong movement, sponsored by government officials and

administrators, for a building and administration to provide adequate space and special care for the rapidly accumulating noncurrent records that agencies found necessary to keep indefinitely for legal and administrative use but that were either in the way for current operations or difficult to preserve and protect physically and to maintain in accessible conditions and usable order when stored in outlying locations. There were a few scholars, such as Dr. J. Franklin Jameson and Dr. Waldo G. Leland, who saw and understood both forces and acted to bring them together in support of legislation broad enough to serve both interests.

It is also pertinent in this account of archival development to note that in the United States the historical society and the library movements got under way much earlier than the archival movement and that, when the latter was still almost nonexistent, the historical societies and librarians represented strong vigorous groups eager to be of maximum service to the community or government they served. As research institutions, they began developing collections of manuscript sources as well as printed materials. Especially if they were state libraries or state supported historical societies, as a service to the governments that supported them, many began to salvage older official documents of exceptional interest. Laws or executive orders legalized such transfers in some cases, but in others there was merely mutual recognition that such transfers would promote the preservation and availability of the records. Where state supported libraries or societies were nonexistent, official records were frequently turned over to private libraries and societies as more appropriate custodial agencies than government offices engrossed in their current business.

Often official records were merely added to the existing manuscript collections and treated, as were other manuscripts, without much realization of the special tenets that should govern in their custody, arrangement, and use. In other cases, however, the official records were maintained as a special unit, and in a few instances, separate archives divisions grew up within the state historical societies or state libraries and became to a certain extent the official archival agencies for the state. Usually, however, archival functions in these agencies have been limited to custody and reference service on a limited body of older records. In the very few cases where a more rounded program has developed, the archives division has had to reach a status of considerable professional autonomy, subject to the librarian only in administrative matters. Broad-minded librarianship and strong archival leadership are the prerequisites if this is to happen.

This interim stage of development is also reflected in the experience of the federal government. The Library of Congress, under authority of a clause inserted in an appropriation act of 1903, began

to take custody of and place in its Division of Manuscripts selected records from other agencies of the federal government. These were often single items or small groups of papers of outstanding historical value that were selected from extensive files left in the custody of the agencies. As the Library began, however, to receive offers from the agencies of larger bodies of older records, it came more fully to understand the magnitude and special character of the archives of the federal government and it swung its support to the movement for a specialized archival agency and building. In the words of the Librarian's Annual Report for 1911, ". . . the Library can not sacrifice its space to the storage of public papers which properly belong to other Government offices. Such papers should go to a national archives depository, and it is gratifying to see that a serious movement is on foot to erect a building for this purpose."[1] Today the Library of Congress continues to serve as a great repository for private manuscript collections and nongovernmental archival materials, but it has released, or is gradually releasing, to the National Archives when they can be recognized and easily separated, such official records of the federal government as it has cared for in this interim. The work of both institutions, and their potential for growth and service in the future, have, it is believed, been strengthened by this logical division of fields.

Both in the federal government and in the states, the older libraries and historical societies entered this field because a vacuum existed. It was a logical extension of their interests at the time and resulted in the preservation and fuller use of many valuable records. But it was, historically speaking, a transition stage, peculiar to the United States (and to Australia, New Zealand, and a few other countries where the situation was similar). The opposite situation prevails on the European continent where, because they were earlier in the field, the archival agencies generally have the custody also of private manuscripts.

Because in some of our states the archive authorities were concerned mostly with the older records and the interests of scholars, the situation with respect to records still in the offices and departments of the state government grew progressively worse, until a third party entered the picture—the forces representing administration and management in operating agencies. The "no man's land" was the area that particularly interested them. The needs of the agencies were not being served. Such a move on the part of those interested in effective records management is always to be expected when archival agencies concern themselves only with those aspects of archival work that are associated with research and scholarship. The management interests have both justice and power on their side. The original purpose of archival agencies was to meet the archival heads of the administration that created and maintained them. In any

fully developed modern archival program these needs are met, and they must be met or the archival program will be cut off from one of the strongest sources of its support and will deteriorate into a shrunken appendage of small value. It is not only the records of the past that it must be concerned with but also the records of the present and of the future both of which will all too soon become records of the past.

An archival agency, whether serving government or some private organization, (and universities and colleges are found under both) must be both a cultural agency and an administrative or management agency in its special field. Its services in the cultural area cannot be fully developed over a period of years unless its services in the administrative area are effectively performed. Its services in the administrative area cannot be effectively performed unless it has an appreciation of the long-term cultural and research values of the records that are created and used in the living agencies of government and that must in time be retired either to its custody or to the ash heap. The cultural and the administrative aspects cannot be separated. Neither one should be emphasized at the expense of the other. An archival program remains healthy and draws its support from both sides only as it effectively performs in its dual role.

A Note on the Literature of Archival Science

There is no textbook, indeed there is no one general book in English, or even in other languages, that can be recommended as surveying the subject of archival theory and practice systematically and including good bibliographical references for further reading. Why? Because there is no universal experience.

Writings even of general character tend to be based on the experiences of the authors with collections with which they are familiar, in specific institutions, and in specific countries. Their generalizations are often misleading to, or misunderstood by, archivists in other countries, and their illustrations and examples are often outside the experiences even of colleagues in their own countries. When one describes techniques and procedures relating to books, one is concerned with identical units that colleagues can know and handle. But archival bodies are unique, and only a colleague who has lived with the body used as an illustration, can really understand what is being said or done about it. Strangers are soon lost in meaningless detail.

But, in a single country there are not enough archivists—or have not been until just recently—to create a demand for texts and manuals that are based upon and explain the special characteristics of that country's records.

Experience, and the lessons learned from it, tend, therefore to remain in the head of the practitioner. It may be that to a considerable degree the work of an archivist is something to be learned by example and through practice rather than through books and classroom teaching. It is a workshop sort of thing. There are operations to perform that one has to watch and then participate in. One thing needed, I feel, in teaching archival practice is more laboratory work. Yet, learning by that method takes a great deal of time, and in addition, one must find time to pull his experiences together and compare notes with others and generalize. That is the nature of much of the writing in the field. You will find it in short articles, and it will consist of accounts of experience with this body of records or that, or "this is the way we handle this problem at our institution."

The central repository in this country for such articles, for just over a quarter century now, has been The American Archivist, the quarterly professional journal of the Society of American Archivists. It has been a good journal consistently and compares favorably with, if it does not excel, other journals in other countries, of which there are about a dozen. These latter are less useful to the beginner for the reasons mentioned above.

There are in English, however, four books that all archivists should know and read frequently. Every archivist should analyze and compare them and know what they have of value and what they lack. Between them, they will contain most of the theory that one needs. One will not understand all of it without some practice on his own account. He will, therefore, reread these books again and again for the greater understanding that can come only after experience. They are here listed in the order in which they were published.

1. Muller, Samuel, et al. Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives. (Translated by Arthur H. Leavitt from the 2nd Dutch edition of 1920.) New York, H. W. Wilson, 1940. (First published in Dutch in 1898 and later translated into French, German, and Italian.)

2. Jenkinson, Hilary. A Manual of Archive Administration. New & rev. ed. London, P. Lund, Humphries & Co. Ltd., 1937. (2nd edition, much revised from the original edition in 1922.)

3. Schellenberg, T.R. Modern Archives; Principles and Techniques. (First published in Melbourne, 1956.) Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1957. (Also translated into a number of languages including Spanish, German, and Hebrew.)

4. Ernest, Posner. American State Archives. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964.

REFERENCES

1. Library of Congress. Report of the Librarian of Congress and Report of the Superintendent of the Library Building and Grounds for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1911. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1911, p. 26.

RECORDS MANAGEMENT

Thornton W. Mitchell

In recent years, records have become a matter of increasing concern. For a long time, there have been archival establishments in which valuable records—or presumably valuable records—have been kept. But modern reproducing methods and natural growth have resulted in more records of less quality for the archivist to deal with. Since World War II, under the leadership of the federal government, there has been a concerted effort to reduce the backlog of old records, to insure the preservation of valuable records, to make records and recorded information more accessible to administrators and researchers, and to create records of high quality. This effort has been directed toward managing the flood of records and paper work that threatens to swamp the activities that create and handle them. There has been discussion for many years about what this effort should be called, and there have been many names applied to it. Since it is concerned with the management of records, the term "records management" seems to be a simple and all-inclusive solution to the problem of a name.

Colleges and universities have become concerned more recently than others with their records problems. There have been several college archives that have attempted to bring valuable material into their custody; there have been other college archives that have, passively, received whatever was thrust at them. The mere creation of a college or university "archives" does not, in itself, solve the problem. Without a program which identifies the records that go into the archives and makes some provision for getting them there, the "archives" are apt to become dumping grounds for material that no one wants but everyone is afraid to do anything about. The absence of a program means that the college or university runs the risk of losing records that should be kept, of keeping records that should be eliminated, of maintaining records under adverse circumstances, of fragmenting documentation, and of making it impossible for either the administrator or historian to benefit from past experience.

We know that records are created. They are then processed and maintained in some manner, and finally they are disposed of

---

The author is Assistant State Archivist (State Records), Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina.

either by destruction or by preservation in an archives. In 1955, the Second Hoover Commission Task Force on Paperwork Management calculated that about 70 per cent of the total cost of a record was in creating it. It would seem reasonable, therefore, to expect that a program to manage records would start with their creation because this represents the greatest potential for savings. This usually is not the manner in which the management of records is approached, however. Most programs come through the back door by starting with the disposal phase first.

Although it is almost like locking the barn door after the horse is stolen (because most of the cost of records has been incurred by the time they are to be disposed of), this approach to records through the disposition phase is reasonable and understandable and, in fact, may be desirable. It is easy to ascertain when records have outlived their usefulness, they frequently represent an immediate and acute problem, the need and the results of doing something about them can be understood more readily, and disposition is productive of immediate results. In addition, before paper work can be controlled and managed, someone must know what paper work there is; and the easiest way to find out is by following the first step in developing records disposition—by making an inventory. Most programs, then, start with the disposition aspect of records management—and too many of them never get away from it.

A disposition program can go to either of two extremes—everything can be kept or everything can be thrown away after a period of years. Neither of these extremes is realistic, but one or the other can easily happen if the disposition program is not carefully planned. There are several things that can be done with records to dispose of them; there are some that for historical or administrative reasons must be kept permanently; there are others that have a relatively short use for the purposes for which they were created but that need to be kept for longer periods of time because of legal, fiscal, or similar requirements; and finally, there are records that should be destroyed after having served the purpose for which they were made.

Records in the first of these three categories represent, obviously, archival material; the second represents material that should be stored in such a way that it is readily available, if needed; and the third is that which can be destroyed. The disposition plan should provide for all three of these categories of records. It is not enough for a plan to call for destroying every possible piece of paper and then keeping the left-over strays as "permanent" records; nor should the plan fail to describe specifically the material that has archival value; this material should be identified and provided for to prevent some unthinking person from destroying it.

The disposition plan is developed by "records scheduling." A schedule is a document that contains a complete disposition plan for the unit concerned. Scheduling starts by making a physical inventory of all records. There is some disagreement that this is either necessary or desirable; but if the schedule does the things that need to be done, the person who prepares it must know what records there are. And no records can be destroyed without knowing what the pattern of documentation within that unit or that institution is. There are some short cuts that can be taken; but the fact remains that it is impossible to evaluate records realistically and intelligently without full information about all of the records and without knowing what will be kept as well as what will be thrown away. If permanent records are considered to be the material that is left after everything possible is thrown away, a schedule can be written without making a complete inventory. But if the positive approach of identifying and selecting archival material first and then throwing everything else away is taken, the schedule must start with an inventory of all records.

The inventory should show several things. First, of course, is the name or the title of the records being inventoried, their inclusive date span, the volume, and the location. It may be advisable to show, also, the manner in which the records are arranged, their relationship to other records, the extent to which the record or the information is duplicated, and other factors that may affect the retention of the record. Analysis of the inventory will give other information as well; for example, if part of a records series is stored, the inclusive date of the stored records will usually give some indication of the period of time after which the records are used less frequently.

Following the inventory, the records are appraised. That is, they are examined from the point of view of their legal, fiscal, administrative, and historical value. Appraisal is deciding whether a record should be kept and for how long and why, or whether it should be destroyed and after how long and why. All of the potential uses and values of the records should be considered in making this determination. And in reviewing potential uses of records, modern methods of processing information have made it feasible to preserve voluminous records whose sheer bulk formerly made use of the data they contained impracticable. With the availability of electronic tabulating equipment and other high speed devices, it is no longer desirable to destroy or to authorize the destruction of records solely on the grounds that their bulk prevents exploitation of the valuable information in them.

Both in the appraisal process and in the succeeding step—writing the schedule—the personnel who use the records should be consulted. Their opinions, however, should not be final because they

may have an exaggerated idea of the value of the records. But they should not be ignored in the entire process, because they work with and know the records and know, further, how the records are used.

The schedule should then be prepared in such a form that it may be referred to readily by those who use it. It should show:

1. Records that are to be kept permanently because they have long-term historical or administrative value. Remember, however, that there are more records designated as permanent than anyone is ever going to want to use and that they tell a lot of things that no one wants to know. There has been some professional discussion about the very small percentage of "permanent" records. Like any generality, this low percentage may be misleading; but the fact remains that there are relatively few records that are worth keeping a long time. These permanent records should go eventually into the archives for preservation.

2. Records that are to be destroyed and after what period of time.

3. Records that may be moved to an intermediate storage area after their immediate usefulness is ended but before their final disposition may be effected. This final disposition may be preservation in the archives or it may be destruction. A college or a university may not be large enough to justify both an archives and an intermediate storage area (records center). But the archivist would be well advised to offer this records center service; transfers into the archives are simplified, and the possibility of accidental destruction of valuable material is minimized. The archivist will find that he is handling the destruction of almost all records that are destroyed; This will, unless the volume is too great, permit him periodically to check the schedule to be sure that it does not call for the destruction of material that should be kept.

4. Records that are to be microfilmed prior to destruction or, in the case of essential records, for dispersal to a security location. Microfilming is expensive (in North Carolina we have computed an average cost of $28 per cubic foot to microfilm records), and it should be used to reduce the volume of records only when the originals must be kept so long that the storage cost offsets the filming cost or when the originals are of such form or size that they cannot be readily preserved in the original. These standards do not, of course, apply to microfilming to obtain a security copy of an essential record.

5. Records that should be reviewed or "screened" prior to destruction. Many small administrative and organizational units have records that do not fit clearly into either the "destroy" or "save" category. These should be looked over by a competent person before they are destroyed. This review may result in all or almost all of

the material being destroyed; but there may be some that is worth keeping. This review is time consuming and costly; but it will insure the preservation of stray items that could easily be thrown away.

The schedule may do other things. It may, for example, provide for the security protection of essential records; and it may even go so far as to provide for reorganizing the files in such a way that a reasonable retention period may be more readily applied. But the schedule should provide for the disposition of all records, regardless of whether that disposition is preservation in an archives, destruction, storage prior to destruction or transfer to an archives, or microfilming. Unless the schedule does all of these, the archives may become a dumping ground and it may prove virtually impossible to obtain transfers of future accumulations of valuable records.

After the schedule has been drafted, it should be discussed with the persons whose records are concerned. In these discussions, it should be remembered that many people have an exaggerated idea of the value of their records and may be defensive about them. In addition, many of the immediate custodians of records neither see nor understand the relationship of their records to others. Usually, the persons immediately responsible for records are conservative in their estimation of the period of time after which they can be disposed of. It is better, however, to accept what may seem to be an unduly long time with the hope that it can be shortened later than it is to risk antagonizing someone who may block the entire program.

The schedule should be approved before it is put into effect. This approval should come from the highest possible authority—the dean of a school, the president or chancellor of a college or university, the head of an agency. And, if the schedule applies to a state college or university, there may be legal requirements for approval as well.

In North Carolina, the state colleges and the University of North Carolina have the same status as government agencies. Two of these have been scheduled in the manner already described. Because it might be years before the other institutions are scheduled, the Department of Archives and History developed a standard which contains suggested retention and disposition periods for major records series. This College and University Records Retention and Disposition Schedule is intended to serve as a guide to their disposition. It schedules not only for destruction, it schedules for retention and for transfers to the college archives. It also suggests microfilming for the security protection of essential records. By implication, it suggests what records should be created.

The schedule is the keystone in records disposition. Without a plan, transfers to the archives and the destruction of obsolete material

are haphazard, and, in all probability, material will be saved that should be thrown away and material will be thrown away that should be saved.

But assuming that the schedule is prepared and approved and is placed in operation, what comes next? In many instances—nothing! Many "records management" programs get to the point that they handle disposition effectively, and there they stop.

Although records disposition may eliminate accumulation of obsolete records promptly, identify and insure the preservation of records with permanent values, and save equipment and space, it does not really solve many records problems. It does not improve the quality of the records, for example, nor does it stop the creation of unnecessary records; it neither makes the recorded information more readily available nor does it simplify the procedures that result in the creation and processing of records. Records management includes a great deal more than records disposition, but with records disposition as the point of departure it is possible to go into some of the more sophisticated techniques that have been developed to manage records and paper work effectively.

The schedule can be the initial step that will lead to effective management of the total life cycle of records. After it has been approved, the persons who apply it find that the manner in which the material is filed rather than the provisions of a schedule control the disposition of it. And if a lot of transitory material is filed with material of more enduring value, it will all be kept for the longer period of time. So the next logical step is into the files maintenance area.

One of the major problems with filing is that most of it is done by persons who were hired because of their competence in some other activity. Most filing is done by persons who were employed because they were good stenographers, good typists, or good something else. And if filing is the major duty of an employee, that employee is probably among the lowest paid. It is little wonder, then, that files and filing represent a major records problem. Not only are filing systems inefficient, but widely scattered duplicate files tend to fragment information and waste filing and finding time.

Files are usually arranged numerically, alphabetically, or by some classification system. Numerical files are those which are arranged according to a preassigned number or by a number that is arbitrarily assigned to identify the document or documents. Numerically arranged files are simple and are easily expandable. Their principal drawback is that numbers usually have no relation to the subject or the name of the material filed, with the result that a numerical file almost universally requires an index of some type. Alphabetical files are usually name files and are arranged by name

regardless of whether they relate to person, place, or thing. They are simple, but they may be difficult to expand because it is not always possible to anticipate within what letter of the alphabet additional material may belong. Some efforts have been made to combine numerical and alphabetical files, but the combinations usually have the drawbacks of both and the advantages of neither.

The third way in which files may be arranged is in some rational order based on the relation of documents and of subjects to each other. This type of arrangement usually involves a classification scheme or system; this is the manner in which subject material is usually arranged. Some classification systems are numerical; the decimal system is perhaps the best known of the numerical classification schemes. Some systems are alphabetical, or they may be combinations of the two. The classification system should, however, bring together documents relating to the same matter or to the same subject. Classifications systems, therefore, are usually used to file so-called subject material.

The system by which subject material is arranged should be simple, flexible, and expansible. It should also be set up in such a way that material of the same or a related subject is brought together. The most simple subject file system is an alphabetical arrangement of subjects in which one folder has no direct relation to the folders preceding or following it. For example, there may be succeeding folders that would be labeled "Annual Reports," "Applications for Employment," and "Automobile Maintenance and Repairs." With a file arranged in this manner, there is also a tendency to file organizationally; that is, to file by the name of the correspondent or the office with which correspondence is exchanged. With material filed in this manner, related subjects may be widely separated; the organizational folders may include material relating to many different subjects; and the relationships of subjects to each other may be completely obscured. Such a system is readily expansible, because there is no end to the number of different subjects that may be inserted into proper alphabetical order.

The best known numerical arrangement for subject material is the Dewey Decimal System. This system is predicated on the assumption that all filed material can be organized into ten major subjects; that each major subject can be divided into ten subdivisions; and so on ad infinitum. Subjects, therefore, are assigned numbers, each digit of which indicates a subject or subdivision thereof. The most serious defect of this type of system is that it is limited to tens—that it is, in other words, not sufficiently flexible. It also has the defect of requiring an index; virtually nothing can be retrieved from it without first consulting an index to determine in which folder search should begin.

There are combinations of alphabetical and numerical schemes in such systems as an alpha-numeric file. The best known file of this type was the Navy Filing System, in which major subjects were assigned letter designators which generally coincided with the first letter of the subject—"A" for Administration and "S" for Supplies, for example. The principal subdivisions were then assigned numbers in sequence, and these subdivisions were then subdivided by numbers in sequence. A file designation in an alpha-numeric system, then, would appear as "A6-6," meaning, in this case "records disposition" as an administrative technique. A system of this type also requires an index, and its expansibility is limited by the number of letters in the alphabet. In addition, two or more major subjects may begin with the same letter—for example, "Administration" and "Aviation"—which require adjustments in the letter designators.

Another refinement of the combined alphabetical and numerical systems is the so-called subject-numeric system in which subject names are used as designators and numbers are assigned to subdivisions. For example, a major subject would be identified as "PERSONNEL;" the major subject then would be subdivided and the subdivisions could then be further divided. These subdivisions are assigned identifying numbers; "PERSONNEL 6" for example, may mean "Employee Relations" and "PERSONNEL 6-2" may mean "Grievances." These designators may be further refined by abbreviating the major heading to, for example, "PERS" with the complete file designator written "PERS 6-6." A system such as the subject-numeric system is simple, flexible, and expansible; subjects can be added, for example, without limit. Its major drawback, however, is the fact that numbers are associated with it and an extensive scheme requires an index for maximum utility.

The most easily used classification system is the so-called self indexing subject system which is similar to other classification systems except that numbers are not used as designators. Major subjects are established; these are then subdivided and the subdivisions are further divided. The names of the subdivisions are used, however, rather than a number. Since the number of major subjects is usually relatively small, a file arranged according to this system can be searched directly from the folder labels without reference to an index first.

Whatever kind of classification system is used, the fact remains that the system provides nothing more than a framework according to which papers and documents are arranged. Whether the system is elaborate or simple, the most important single operation in regard to filing is deciding to which subject a particular document relates. This decision-making is called classifying—deciding under what subject a document shall be placed. Various systems have weaknesses; but the major problems with any system result

from human failure in deciding where something shall be filed. Whatever system is used, it should be tailored to the particular needs that it is intended to meet. An elaborate decimal system would be senseless in a subject file that occupies half a drawer; a simple subject system arranged alphabetically would be useless in a file that occupies 200 file cabinets. An organizational file may be the simplest when the relationships between subjects are not elaborate and most of the correspondence is exchanged with a few persons or organizations.

There is no "best" system except the one that best fits a particular situation. But this does not prevent the person who is responsible for files from doing the things that indicate they are well managed: drawers properly labeled; folders labeled and the folder tabs in proper order to show the nature of the subject it holds; folders not bulging; files broken so that only current material is in current files; guides properly used; out cards or charge-outs properly used. Any one of these is small; in the aggregate, however, they make the difference between good and poor management.

Although a records management program may begin with records disposition, it is soon found that decisions made in filing and files maintenance have the greatest effect on the disposition of records. Records management then progresses to the filing area, and here it soon finds that decisions that were made when the records were created have the greatest effect on the way that files are set up and maintained. The number of copies of a letter, for example, and the number of different subjects in a letter affect the way in which it is filed; the manner in which reports are authorized, prepared, and submitted have an impact on the files; and the way in which records and paper work pass through an office or series of offices may determine whether the transaction is documented properly or whether it is fragmented.

Records are usually created as correspondence, forms, and reports. They are created, in other words, as communications from one place or one person to another; as information that is organized in a particular way or for a particular purpose; and as organized information that is transmitted from one person or place to another. Obviously, reports can be made as letters in a narrative style or as organized data on a form. Since most of the money spent on records is spent in creating them, the need for work in the records creation area of records management is obvious.

Letters, generally, may be hard to read and to understand because they are too long. The savings that result from shortening a single letter by one-quarter would be minimal; but on as few as 100 letters a year they would be substantial. When a letter is shortened, there should be no reduction in the thought content; rather the excess and unneeded words should be cut out. Letters are costly, also, be-

cause many people who write letters find them hard to write. And many of the people who find it a chore to write a letter feel that the two or three letters they produce each day should each be a masterpiece of erudition. Letters should be simple—they are usually written to answer a question or to ask or tell a person something. They should be written in words that people understand—in picture words rather than abstractions.

Many repetitive letters can be printed and used as form letters. To be effective, a form letter should have a minimum of fill-ins and the fill-ins should be located so that they can be completed without difficulty. Form letters should be used if they deal with routine business or informational matters; they should not be used for personal letters and for letters that contain a message that brings grief or disappointment to the reader. A form letter with ten lines is economical if it is used at least twenty times a month; fifteen lines fifteen times a month; twenty or more lines ten times a month. The economy of a form letter, then, is measured in terms of the number of lines and the number of times used per month.

If a letter is not used enough times for it to be economical to be printed, it may be possible to use a pre-written pattern or guide letter. A letter of this type is written in advance of use, fits a particular situation, and may be prepared by a typist who has been instructed to write a particular letter. The principal advantages of form and pattern letters is that they are well written, they contain only necessary information and avoid excess verbiage, and they can be written and mailed promptly.

Just as it is possible to manage correspondence, so is it possible to manage forms. The goal of forms management, however, is somewhat different; its aim ís to eliminate unnecessary forms, combine forms that are similar, and to simplify necessary forms so that they can be filled out more easily. In order to have a forms control program, particularly if the number of forms is not large, it is not necessary to assemble samples of all forms and then to classify them into functions. With a large number of forms, a functional file will certainly bring together forms that perform a like or common function. The most effective way to control forms, however, is to review them in the context of the procedural operation that uses them. Too frequently, a procedure is designed to fit forms that are already in use; actually, the forms should fit the procedure.

A great deal of attention has been paid to the proper design of forms, and this should be considered as a part of the effective management of forms. C. Northcote Parkinson in his scholarly discussion of Parkinson's Law describes forms design in these words: "The art of devising forms to be filled in depends on three elements: obscurity, lack of space, and the heaviest penalties for failure. In a

form-compiling department, obscurity is ensured by various branches dealing respectively with ambiguity, irrelevance, and jargon."[1] Many forms seem to meet these standards, but they need not. Most forms are now filled in by typewriter and the form should be designed so that the lines conform to machine spacing and the entries should be lined up so that they can be made with a minimum number of tab stops. Design standards may be simple, and a properly designed form can be filled in in a fraction of the time required to fill in a poorly designed form—and clerical time costs money.

Reports are a paper work burden. The reporting pattern resembles an inverted pyramid: at the top are many separate offices each requiring only one or two relatively simple reports; and all of these zero in on a single office at the bottom of the heap which is faced with the gigantic task of preparing dozens of reports. Reports duplicate each other—the same or substantially the same information is reported to more than one place; they are made too frequently—often at a frequency which has no relation to the reported data; they cost too much—if a report costs several thousand dollars to prepare it may not be worth the cost of preparing it.

There are many different techniques by which the creation of records can be managed or controlled. There are formal, conventional control programs. Records can also be managed through what has been called a systems approach—that is, a review of procedures which will automatically result in review of the paper work that accompanies them. Streamlining of the procedure will automatically streamline the accompanying paper work. But whatever management technique is used, the fact remains that the creation of records must be managed or paper work will completely overwhelm the operations it is supposed to assist.

Why should an archivist be concerned with the management of current records? Why should the custodian of historical documents be concerned about techniques for controlling the creation of records? The archivist is concerned with permanently valuable records—not only of the past but of the present. The archives of the future are being created and filed right now; if the archivist does not protect his interests in the permanently valuable material during its creation, maintenance, and eventual disposition, he must be satisfied with whatever manages to survive. If he participates actively in the creation, maintenance, and disposition of all records, he will protect his interest in the relatively small percentage that comprises permanent documentation.

Too frequently, the archivist has been pushed aside while the records manager practices his trade upon the records with which the archivist will eventually be concerned. Then, when all decisions have been made and the records have been created, filed, and finally disposed of, the remnanent passes to the archivist.

The archivist, then, has a dual responsibility. First, he must preserve the historical heritage of the institution which he serves; second, he must insure that the documentation of that heritage is of the highest possible quality. The latter is possible only through the proper management of records and paper work. Many an archivist may feel that he is above the mundane problems of administration and management which appear to be the special province of records management. Unless he injects himself into these areas, however, the archivist will find that he has less and less influence over the activities with which he is specially concerned. Today the archivist can no longer function in his ivory tower; to be effective, he has no alternative but to participate actively and aggressively in the management of the material from which the items comprising his "archives" come.

REFERENCES

1. Parkinson, C. Northcote. Parkinson's Law. Cambridge, The Riverside Press, 1957, p. 109.

RECORDS MANAGEMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY*

Records Management General

Commission on Organization of Executive Branch of the Government. Task Force Report on Paperwork Management: Part I--In the United States Government. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1955.

DePaul University. Memorandum to the Records Management Act. Washington, D. C., Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, 1959.

Griffin, Mary Claire. Records Management: A Modern Tool for Business. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Records Management and Preservation. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1961.

Ross, H. John. Paperwork Management: A Manual of Workload Reduction Techniques. South Miami, Florida, Office Research Institute, c. 1961.

*This bibliography makes no claim to being definitive or complete. It indicates to the novice some of the sources of additional information on various phases of records management.

Schellenberg, T. R. Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Records Creation

Bureau of the Budget. Simplifying Procedures through Forms Control. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1948.

Butterfield, William H. Common Sense in Letter Writing. Englewood Cliffs, N. C., Prentice-Hall, Inc., c. 1963.

General Services Administration. Form Letters [Records Management Handbook: Managing Correspondence]. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1954.

General Services Administration. Forms Analysis [Records Management Handbook: Managing Forms]. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, rev. 1960.

General Services Administration. Forms Design [Records Management Handbook: Managing Forms]. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, rev. 1960.

General Services Administration. Guide Letters [Records Management Handbook: Managing Correspondence]. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1955.

General Services Administration. Plain Letters [Records Management Handbook: Managing Correspondence]. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1955.

Knox, Frank M. Design and Control of Business Forms. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952.

Department of the Navy. Forms Management (NMO Inst 5213.5). Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1958.

Sheppard, Mona. Plain Letters: The Secret of Successful Business Writing. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1960.

Files Maintenance

American Records Management Association. Rules for Alphabetical Filing. Los Angeles, American Records Management Association, 1960.

Department of the Army. Installing and Using the Army Functional Files System (Department of the Army Pamphlet No. 345-1). Washington, D. C., Department of the Army, 1958.

Department of the Navy. Guide to Better File Operations (NMO Inst 5211.6). Washington, D. C., Navy Management Office, 1957.

General Services Administration. Files Operations [Records Management Handbook: Managing Current Files]. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1964.

North Carolina Department of Archives and History. Files and Filing [Records Management Handbook]. Raleigh, 1963.
Odell, Margaret K., and Strong, Earl P. Records Management and Filing Operations. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1947.

Records Disposition

California Department of Finance. Records Disposition [Paperwork Management Handbook]. Sacramento, 1961.
General Services Administration. Applying Records Schedules [Records Management Handbook: Managing Noncurrent Files]. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, rev. 1961.
Mitchell, William E. Records Retention. Evansville, Ind., Ellsworth Publishing Co., rev. 1963.
North Carolina Department of Archives and History. Records Disposition [Records Management Handbook]. Raleigh, rev. 1964.
North Carolina Department of Archives and History. State Records Center [Records Management Handbook]. Raleigh, 1963.

Miscellaneous

Department of the Army. Microfilming of Records (Technical Manual TM 12-257). Department of the Army, 1955.
Bureau of the Budget. Process Charting: Its Use in Procedural Analysis. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1945.
General Services Administration. Agency Mail Operations [Records Management Handbook: Managing Mail]. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1957.
General Services Administration. Protecting Vital Operating Records [Records Management Handbook: Managing Current Files]. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1958.
The George Washington University. Records Essential for Identification of Persons: An Inventory and Evaluation of Public Records Relating to Identification of Individuals during Emergency and Post-Emergency Periods. Washington, D. C., 1961.
North Carolina Department of Archives and History. College and University Records Retention and Disposition Schedule. Raleigh, 1964.
Woman's College of the University of North Carolina [University of North Carolina at Greensboro]. Archives: Records Schedule. Greensboro, 1962.

THE COLLECTING OF ARCHIVAL MATERIALS AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Edith M. Fox

Cornell University was among the pioneers in the development of a university archives and a regional history collection. The physical results of that endeavor are at times so annoyingly apparent in expanding stacks and worrisome storage places as to obscure the research values of the bulky records that cause the trouble. In contrast, the books and articles which have been wholly or partially based on these materials take little room, although a surprisingly large number of them are scattered through any major library.

The pioneering days have ended. During the past decade, a fair number of universities have established archives, and, occasionally, related manuscript divisions. National, state, and city agencies, universities, historical societies, and other institutions have issued guides to their holdings. The Library of Congress maintains a union list of manuscripts. Despite the pains of growth and their attendant problems, these agencies and institutions are cooperating with enthusiasm to make primary sources better and more widely available to serious researchers. Never have scholars had such a wealth of resources within their easy reach.

At a university like Cornell, where the archival and regional history department is within the library system and housed in a great research library, the scholar oriented to the primary source has the additional good fortune of having the published primary and secondary sources at hand. Such a situation can be ideal, particularly if the primary source is not sacrificed in the interests of the secondary source.

It is impossible to consider the collecting of archival materials at Cornell as a distinct and separate activity. Regional History and the University Archives are two co-equal units constituting one department. At the present time, they are so closely knit that a divorce might prove disastrous for both, as well as for the cause of research. That the University Archives had, in a way, its beginnings in Regional History and that the single purpose of collecting became a dual purpose have deeply influenced the character of each.

The Collection of Regional History was established in October of 1942 with the aid of a Rockefeller Foundation grant. It was thought

---

Mrs. Fox is Curator of Regional History and University Archivist, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

that grass-roots collecting of manuscripts and ephemera relating to the common man of the region might reveal through research certain regional differences and a pattern. But the fragmentary evidence collected showed no particular pattern and few correlations. The many account books then garnered may never be of much use except as objects of curiosity a thousand years hence. Sets of family papers, small or large, remain undisturbed in the stacks, waiting for the touch of research to realize their potential value.

Despite the talk in those early days about the historical value of the regional sources, no scholar took so much as a nibble at them. Whitney Cross, a former Cornell curator, satisfied some of his frustrations of being a collector without a researching clientele by acquiring the papers of Edward Eggleston which had attached to them the biographer who continued to use them. The Hoosier Schoolmaster certainly represented the common man if not the region.[1]

Three years later, in 1945, when I became head of the makeshift cubbyhole quarters with a door to which there were 240 keys on the lower campus, I was still a graduate student, with Professor Paul W. Gates as my chairman. The most active individual behind the creation of almost any American manuscript division in a university is an historian in search of primary sources for himself and/or his graduate students. Professor Gates had played that role in the creation of Regional History. After 1945, and for some years, the emphasis in collecting was on records generally originating in the region and relating to agriculture, land policies, railroads, the lumber industry, and similar topics. A number of Professor Gates' students used some of these papers for theses, a goodly share of which were published.

A pioneering spirit held the professor, the students, and the curator in an enthusiastic, highly advantageous association. One result was that the curator came to identify collecting aims so closely with real or potential research needs that one could not be thought of without the other. This identification helped to make for a definition of a university archives which is broader and richer for the research content than is generally accepted in the archival world.

The definition of the university archives as a depository not only for the historical documents and official records of the institution but also for the private papers of those who created the documents and records was inherent in the founding and continuing existence of Cornell University. The founding was an intimate personal experience for two very different men. Some months before opening day, President Andrew D. White wrote, "Night & day I have worked for this University—I am willing to give my life & all I have for it."[2] A few months after that bright October day, Ezra Cornell wrote to his wife that the establishment of Cornell University was the

culmination of all his successes, which were reached through grievous toil and suffering.[3] The backgrounds, experiences, and philosophies of these two men formed the mold in which the plan of the university was cast. Both men knew this.

Cornell and White were more than founders who established a university similar more or less to other institutions of higher learning. They created a new university which Allan Nevins designated as ". . . the most remarkable phenomenon in higher education during the postwar decade."[4]

The nature of that phenomenon is concisely and best described in The History of Cornell by Morris Bishop:

> The Cornell Idea was a compound of two ideas: the Ezra Cornell Idea and the Andrew D. White Idea. The Ezra Cornell Idea was expressed in his famous motto. It was an appeal for education to meet recognized needs and lacks in American life. It insisted on the test by utility, on the practical applications of studies. The Andrew D. White Idea was the motivation by the desire to learn, in place of disciplinary education. It transferred the power of choice from the teacher to the student. It insisted on the individual's rights in full confidence that the free individual, with kindly guidance, will find his way to wisdom and virtue.[5]

Neither Cornell, nor White, nor their contemporaries explained or defined the Cornell Idea although everybody talked about it. Professor Bishop wrote that he had difficulty in defining it. No great light is shed on the problem by the official records: the Charter, REGISTER, the various announcements, the letters by Cornell, White, and others which were kept as exhibits or official letters in the Trustees' Minutes, the lecture notes, the outlines of courses, and the other documents and records.

There are, of course, choice bits about early activities tucked away in the official records. One daybook, kept by the business manager, gives a running account for the first year in Cascadilla Hall, a former water-cure sanatorium, a barracks of a place which had class rooms and laboratories, and housed the faculty and their families as well as the students. Professors demanded new equipment and scolded about students throwing slops from the upper windows. A great hubbub over coal ended in coal tickets for all. A student from Harvard, refusing to eat with the hoi polloi, had his meals in his room. The laboratory of Professor Burt G. Wilder, the first anatomist, stank so terribly that everyone felt ill. Ezra Cornell sent the night soil from the privies to fertilize the university vegetable gardens. Founder's Day, Ezra Cornell's birthday, was celebrated with dancing, a sinful pleasure in the eyes of Ithacans. President White

turned the place upside down in preparation for the eminent Goldwin Smith, the British political economist. He even installed a bell so Smith would not have to yell for service. But with all this, and White's plans for the faculty, Cornell's reports on construction, the trustees' deliberations, and the constant display of pioneering enthusiasm and discomfort, there is nothing which defines the great innovation of the Cornell Idea.

Professor Bishop produced his definition after many hours spent in reading the private papers of Cornell and White. In terms of his own perspective and knowledge, he recreated their backgrounds and experiences, understood their philosophies, and gave meaning to the aims which were so concrete in practice, yet so nebulously expressed in theory. And given the warm human nature of his sources, he was able to produce a warm human book, the most delightful, well-written, and scholarly university history yet published.

Just as the combination of the private Cornell and White papers with the official records of the day are needed to understand the new university, so are needed the same combination of private and official records for any study of later developments at Cornell, be it a college, a department, or even a position. Each development is deep-rooted in the private interests and personalities of one or more individuals. And this is as true of Regional History and the University Archives as of any other department.

What happened to the official records and the private papers down through the years at Cornell is more or less typical of what happened elsewhere. Official records of the university were saved, sometimes less carefully than they should have been, but on the whole very well indeed, and not necessarily for business or legal reasons.

The University Library held a few private papers but had no interest in them. There was no demand for them. Only the papers of great men were saved by institutions. The private papers of more ordinary men were saved in the attics of the big houses of the day. But the Library carefully saved its official papers, and the Cornell University Archives has a beautiful set of them. On the other hand, the private papers of Daniel Willard Fiske, the first librarian, papers Professor Bishop found most useful, were thrown in the library tower and allowed to dry rot and almost disintegrate.

Andrew D. White considered his papers important, partly because of the letters famous men had written to him. His literary executor kept the files intact in the library. Like his cofounder, Ezra Cornell wanted his papers saved for posterity. Information expressed in them about the development of the telegraph, as well as about the founding of the University warranted preservation. But his papers became divided among members of the family. Many of them are scattered about the country.

The Library may have ignored, even mistreated, the contemporary private papers for whose care it was neither trained, equipped, nor supported, and for which the demand was infinitesimal, but it did very well by Cornelliana—the pamphlets, stunt books, scrap books, and other ephemera, and the official and unofficial publications, all of which are vital as supplements to manuscripts, and in themselves. In fact, the numerous items are so well cataloged and shelved that the process of getting them into the Archives where they belong is taking forever.

An acceleration of developments, changes, and events during the 1940's precipitated the establishment of the official archives in 1951 and determined its nature and position. Of course, the tremendous increase of scholarly research in primary sources was and is the growing and powerful force for preservation. Otherwise, the great paper war would be quickly solved by total destruction, except for a few choice captives.

We have already seen how the emphasis at Cornell on regional history made for a broad definition of a university archives. The very aims of regional history demanded the establishment of an archives. A curator could not collect the records of small educational institutions on the basis of their values for research without coming to have strong feelings about the records of one of the great universities of the country.

The research interest of a number of historians suddenly turned toward Cornell as a subject for investigation with the use of archival records presupposed. Walter P. Rogers analyzed Andrew D. White's influence on the development of the modern university in terms of what he found in the private papers.[6] And Paul W. Gates focused attention on the potential research values of Cornell's business records through his extensive use of the Western Lands papers for his study of Cornell's Wisconsin pine lands, a study important for Wisconsin history as well as Cornell's history as a land grant college.[7] A nostalgic appreciation for the university's beginnings was subtly engendered by Carl Becker in his preliminary lectures and his published Cornell University: Founders and Founding.[8] This appreciation was not dissipated but strengthened by the death of that illustrious historian in 1945, two years after the publication of his book. The research interest of these three historians had made use of the non-current official records as well as the private papers.

Whitney R. Cross, having his hands full in organizing and building a new collection and also thinking that regional and Cornell archival materials were not compatible in a regional collection, refused to round up usable archival sources on campus, and accepted those sources only when necessary. But this speaker could not resist gathering university records and papers which might be of

quick interest to scholars. The papers of Ezra Cornell and Andrew D. White were begged from the Library and along with other sources from the campus, most of them private papers, were brought to the archives. After the publication of The Second Report of the Curator, 1945-1946, CORNELL UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES was never again used as one of the entries in the report of Regional History. It had become clear that there would have to be a separation between records of the region and those of the university, if Cornell were ever to have an archives of its recorded history.

There was the nagging worry about records and papers disappearing. It was Professor George Healey, now Curator as well of Rare Books and Manuscripts, who asked one day, "And what ever happened to the Charles Kendall Adams' papers?" The question was tossed back and forth and all around the campus until it was discovered that the papers of Cornell's second president had been sacrificed to a scrap paper drive during the war. However, Professor Healey's question continues to be echoed in the hope that someone salvaged them, and that they will be returned to Cornell.

And then there happened a threat to Cornell's non-current records which could have been a catastrophe. One June evening, a flash flood and a broken storm sewer poured water into a vault located in the sub-basement of a girls' dormitory, the vault used by the Treasurer's Office and various administrative officers to store a large quantity of non-current records. Most of these records, except for an excess of vouchers, were worth permanent preservation.

From time to time, administrative officers, who were most cooperative, had allowed the removal of sets of records to be added to Regional History's holdings. Although the quarters given over to Regional History were far from ideal, they were certainly an improvement on the sub-basement. But the records still in this vault were now faced with destruction.

The flood water rose to a height of two feet and remained there until discovered. In a sense, the event was not without an advantage. During the rest of the week, the endless ironing of legal documents and the twenty-four hour-a-day drying by hot air of the other records demonstrated in a way words could not that the sub-basement of a girls' dormitory was no proper place for Cornell's historical records.

In the meantime, Regional History had become an administrative unit of the University Library, the Rockefeller grant having ended. This change determined the organizational place the Archives would have. Stephen A. McCarthy, recently appointed Director of the Library, was well disposed toward university archives. His taste leaned toward the preservation of the private papers of Cornell's notables, a taste he shared with a number of faculty members. Even the patron historian of Regional History, despite his wide experience

with state and national archives, despite his scholarly grubbing among non-current records in campus catchalls, distrusted any proposal which would allow a retirement of records program to threaten the collecting of historical sources. In any case, if he wanted to research in Cornell's old business records, which no one else cared to do at that time, he had only to ask the Treasurer's Office for a key.

Cornell's centennial was then a few short years away, and there was concern among those who had a deep affection for the past about having sources available for the historian to use once he was appointed. Not much connection was seen between the papers to be brought together and Regional History, the campus center for collecting contemporary sources. An affiliation was regularly discouraged by the sight of the curator always returning to campus with a truckload of soot-covered records and dumping them in the middle of a respectable Cornell University building.

It was disturbing to realize that the choicest private papers were to be brought together and designated the University Archives. It appeared wrong to have the University Archives include only the non-current official record and the historical document, although that is the acceptable form in archival circles. Too many institutions had the most precious private papers in the Library, and, ingloriously off to one side, the official files and records in a Records Center. In the gap between them there fell to destruction all the sources judged without value in a perspectiveless present. It appeared that the role of the historian was being confused with that of the archivist, his loyal servant. The ghosts of the grand old historians of the past century who gathered their own sources were walking on our campus.

After some reflection along these lines, I suggested to McCarthy that I try writing a proposal for a proper University Archives. He thought it a good idea. Eventually, after considerable thought and work, I gave the results to him. The Library Board recommended the establishment to the Faculty, which approved and in turn made a recommendation to the Trustees that the University Archives be established under the jurisdiction of the University Library and that the development and management of the University Archives be made the responsibility of the University Archivist under the delegated authority from the Director of the Library. The University Archives was to be one of two co-equal units in the same quarters under a Curator of Regional History and University Archivist. There was also to be an Advisory Council. An orderly retirement program for the entire University was to be established.

The Trustees began their resolution with a statement that a University Archives be established to insure the preservation of the significant records of the University and their organization for use in historical studies and research. The significant records were (1) non-current records of permanent value, and (2) records relating to

the history of the University and to the persons connected with it. The records could be manuscript, printed, photographic, or of other forms.

Within a short time after the establishment of the University Archives, non-current records began to be retired from the New York State College of Agriculture, the most significant for us at that time being the files of former deans, and records relating to extension work. These records showed Cornell's role as an integral part of rural New York. There were many and marked correlations between these records and those in Regional History relating to the farmer, cooperatives, farm organizations, and other agricultural manifestations in this region.

The relationship between Regional History and the University Archives began to change rapidly. The change was inherent in the appointment of the Curator as the Curator and University Archivist. The University Archives is now the dominant partner in the "two coequal units" relationship, except in the field of political papers. With few exceptions, the collecting for Regional History is now within Cornell's sphere of interest as it is represented by holdings in the Archives. The results are excellent for the research interest in and of a few colleges, notably the New York State College of Agriculture. The research interests, real or potential, of other colleges, departments, and offices have been neglected only in the sense that the University Archivist has had the entire burden of retiring and collecting records in addition to many administrative and professional duties and has generally answered the strongest demands first.

Agriculture, engineering, and architecture illustrate the different levels of strength in primary sources that are encountered. Agriculture is an example of a subject area having rich resources. Its records and papers constitute more than a quarter of the bulk of the department's entire holdings, the giant share being in Archives. Both administrators and faculty members of The New York State College of Agriculture have been and are most cooperative in retiring or giving their non-current records and private papers and those of their predecessors to the Archives. Research interest in these holdings is broad and varied and comes from the campus and beyond campus. This interest was largely responsible for the creation of Regional History. Scholarly use has been stimulated by grants and aids, one of which recently supported an Oral History Project which in its turn produced more records.

On the other hand, engineering is slightly represented. Regional History early acquired a few sets of choice professional papers. There are scattered records and papers relating to the development and administration of the various engineering colleges. The Cornell Society of Engineers is retiring its records to the Archives. There

are three reasons for the paucity of records. A former dean has been using records to write a history. There has been no demand for research material in this area to stimulate collecting. The University Archivist has not exerted enough pressure for a retirement program. In contrast, the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory at Buffalo has co-operated in working out a retirement program.

Regional collecting on a small scale and the retirement of archival records in the field of architecture supported a research project of great cultural value. The primary sources had been used to some extent but not extensively by students and others before Professor Kermit C. Parsons began work on an architectural history of Cornell. He had the aid of a graduate student in history who combed through archival and regional records looking for letters, drawings, photographs, and other sources for over two years.

The faculty of the College of Architecture is highly cooperative in the retirement of its records and the giving of private papers. At present, a plan is being worked out for collecting regional records within Cornell's sphere of interest in answer to the need of research materials for a project in city planning and urban renewal.

The same statement can be made about other fields of interest as represented by colleges, departments, and offices on campus. Certainly, the disciplines at Cornell and the ever-increasing emphasis on original research indicate a strong future in well-rounded collections of manuscript and other primary sources in many fields.

The acquisition of primary sources through retirement or collecting of records more often than not begins with prolonged menial labor. It has none of the dignity of purchase from a dealer. The sight of the collector struggling in storerooms on campus or elsewhere with dusty and sometimes mice-ridden files and always maintaining that special high level of enthusiasm may earn the epithet "junk-collector" and the job-description "All that is needed is an open hand." But it is this acquisition which brings pleasure to the archivist and creates a truly useful archives.

REFERENCES

1. Eggleston, Edward. The Hoosier Schoolmaster; A Novel. New York, O. Judd and Company, 1871.

2. Andrew W. White to Joseph Harris, Feb. 24, 1868. In "Trustees' Minutes, Cornell University."

3. Cornell to Mary Ann, Jan. 17, 1869. In "Ezra Cornell Papers." At Cornell University Archives.

4. Nevins, Allan. The Emergence of Modern America, 1865-1878. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1927, p. 272.

5. Bishop, Morris. The History of Cornell. Ithaca, N. Y., Cornell University Press, 1962, p. 177.

6. Rogers, Walter P. Andrew D. White and the Modern University. Ithaca, N. Y., Cornell University Press, 1942.

7. Gates, Paul W. The Wisconsin Pine Lands of Cornell University; A Study in Land Policy and Absentee Ownership. Ithaca, N. Y., Cornell University Press, 1943.

8. Becker, Carl. Cornell University: Founders and the Founding. Ithaca, N. Y., Cornell University Press, 1943.

APPRAISAL AND PROCESSING

Maynard Brichford

How records are appraised and processed in the University Archives at Illinois will be the subject of this discussion. At the University of Illinois, the University Archives is located in the Library. Wherever the archivist may be located organizationally, he should be out of his office two-thirds of the time. While processing must be done in the Archives, the archivist should define and standardize processing procedures so that he may spend his time in locating the historical documentation relating to the activities of the university's staff and students. Effective appraisal must be done in offices, storerooms, stockrooms, and basements. Every time records are moved the chances of disarrangement and loss increase.

I have never seen a position description describing the duties of a university archivist. Such a description should cover these points. The archivist must have freedom to contact sources of archival material, to act quickly on his own responsibility, to appraise the research or historical value of material, to classify according to an archival system, and to destroy material lacking sufficient evidential or informational value to warrant its continued retention. An archivist should have three lives: as a researcher, a records manager, and an administrator. As a researcher, he would learn the researcher's requirements for primary source material. As a records manager, he would learn the importance of quality records and how to select those records most worthy of preservation. As an administrator, he would gain an appreciation of the administrator's view of archives and the techniques involved in the creation of records.

Records Appraisal Standards

The most important part of the archivist's work and the least evident to the outsider is the appraisal of records for their archival value. In systems analysis I found it most valuable to remember

---

Maynard Brichford is University Archivist, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Rudyard Kipling's line from "The Elephant's Child," "I keep six honest serving-men. They taught me all I knew. Their names are What and Why and When, and How and Where and Who." For archival work, four of these serving men suffice. We need to know what to keep and why. We need to know who will use it and how.

Before proceeding with appraisal techniques, I shall list the most common types of records that may be housed in a University Archives. Most archives will include official records from campus offices. We define them as all records, documents, correspondence, accounts, files, manuscripts, publications, photographs, tapes, drawings, or other material bearing upon the activities and functions of the university or its officers and employees, academic and non-academic. Records produced or received by the university in the transaction of its business become university property. Subject files, correspondence, personnel records, academic records, and business records accumulate rapidly and will likely be the archivist's first concern. These files constitute the framework of the institution's documentation.

A second type of records are the private personal papers of faculty and administrative staff. These should also be the definite responsibility of the archivist. It is not necessary to draw fine lines of distinction between university property and personal property. If they are valuable, take them as university records by records disposal procedures, or take them as private papers by agreement with the donor. Private papers are more difficult to acquire than office files and frequently are more valuable to the researcher. Letters, journals, notebooks, diaries, scrapbooks, photographs, and manuscripts reveal professional interests and opinions which enable the researcher to relate a man's academic career to his total interests. A professor will write to an absent colleague in language that he would never put in a report to the President or Dean. The full story of the academic community is best represented in documentation accumulated by outstanding faculty members.

Records of student and faculty organizations are valuable. At Wisconsin and Illinois we have found literally hundreds of student organizations representing the academic, social, professional, political, and religious interests of the student body. Many of these organizations will leave few records beyond the annual photograph in the yearbooks, but all should be surveyed for possible material of research value; such as Phi Beta Kappa addresses and the minutes of the University Club.

University publications should be integrated into the Archives and filed as series in the appropriate sub-group with official records and faculty papers. Carefully collected and evaluated, publications may permit the destruction of many cubic feet of supporting work

papers. This is especially true in the area of business records and automated academic records keeping systems, where the informational content is most important. When fiscal and procedural audits permit the destruction of such records, the researcher generally retains an interest in only the summaries and published reports.

The acquisition of publications may pose problems. Your library has probably collected college or university publications since the institution was organized. With the development of the mimeograph machine and the offset press, the publishing functions have become so decentralized and have grown so rapidly that both administrators and librarians have been buried beneath a flood of serials, studies, reports, catalogs, circulars, bulletins, pamphlets, announcements, and other published issuances. The archivist can make a real contribution by using his classification system and control techniques to bring order to this chaotic situation. Thus far, we have taken the following steps at Illinois:

1. The "Illinois Collection" of University publications is being disbanded. One copy of all items will be placed in the Archives. If necessary, extra copies will be placed in the general stacks under a subject matter classification or a University classification. These copies circulate, while Archives copies do not. Other duplicate copies will be destroyed.
2. One copy of all University Press and Printing Division publications is sent directly to the Archives.
3. If any doubt exists about our holding a publication, we request that the office or faculty member send it to the Archives so we may check it against our holdings. We also receive university publications sent to the Library.

Many Archives include theses, papers, and dissertations. They form a valuable adjunct to the university publications and departmental academic records. At Illinois, these items are retained by the general library.

Other archives, and I am sure that many of you are or will be in this group, have collections of regional history manuscripts or literary manuscripts. These valuable resources for scholarship may be boxed and processed like archival material, but they are not archives and should not be intermingled in catalogs or storage areas with the university or college archives.

What aspects of recorded human experience shall be preserved? An archivist cannot rely upon principles, laws, and schedules to determine what shall be kept. It is most important that he read widely and well and interview. He should keep reference statistics on users, purposes, and series used. The first and most important

aspect of records appraisal is preparation by securing a thorough knowledge of the functions of the office that created, filed, or published the records. For official records, the archivist should consult the college or university catalog; the administrative history in his classification guide; any histories of the college, department, or office and field notes or memoranda covering previous correspondence, contacts, and visits. These sources should orient the archivist to the organizational development, functions, policies, and procedures of the creating office. Sometimes a working knowledge of your institution may require personal interviews with faculty and administrative staff. Such interviews contribute to an intelligent collection policy and effective assistance to researchers as well as to the archivist's ability to evaluate his material.

For faculty papers, the archivist should read and outline a biographical sketch in Who Was Who in America, Who's Who in America, American Men of Science, National Academy of Sciences' Biographical Memoirs, Directory of American Scholars, or another suitable biographical record. He should then check his records for a vita and a list of the subject's publications. At this point, it might be necessary to spend an hour with an encyclopedia or some textbooks to acquaint oneself with the academic field and the major lines of development and research interest. Published institutional histories may provide additional perspective. This takes time and talent, but both can be secured if you want a functioning university archives. If you find the transition from historian to physicist to agronomist to architect difficult, you should not be a university archivist.

For publications, preparation is largely a matter of identifying their source and purpose. The problems of personal negotiations are usually eliminated by a procedural requirement that a copy of all publications be sent to the Archives. Appraisal is further simplified by a policy decision on what types of published material will not be retained. In this category, we usually include blank forms, letterheads, envelopes, routine form letters and office announcements, announcements of events which are listed on the University Calendar, announcement posters, and transmittal sheets.

Archival material is retained for its evidential or informational value. Archives are records of who did what and why. To obtain the most significant records we need criteria for determining the value or quality of the various records series. In general, we should select records with the greatest potential value to researchers, covering the broadest range of the university's activities for the longest time with the smallest volume of the most easily understandable records.

The first of two standard approaches is a horizontal selection of the top level records. Valuable policy documentation is usually quite understandable and takes the shape of minutes, correspondence, reports, and subject files. It is seldom on punched cards or magnetic

tape. Care should be taken to avoid duplication of official records at the president's office, dean's office, and departmental levels, or between the business office and line offices. Avoidable duplication usually exists in directives, reports, and files which contain a common form. Subject and correspondence files will contain a large proportion of unavoidable duplication. It is unavoidable because the cost of weeding exceeds the cost of processing and storing the extra volume.

A second technique is the vertical selection of a segment of an organization's records which documents systems and procedures. This may require a sampling of various records from routine work papers and memoranda through data processing records to a final report.

The modern university is engaged in teaching, research, and service. The archivist should select records containing adequate documentation of these three basic functions. We can agree that the summary academic transcript for each student, final reports of research activity, and periodic reports of service offices should be retained in the Archives. While these synoptic records do not present appraisal problems, the archivist must make daily decisions on other records which will determine our knowledge of the past. In all areas, he should be sensitive to the quality of the records. While recognizing that all records have some archival value, he will shortly realize that only from three to ten per cent can be preserved. In a recent review of inventory work sheets for records at the University of Illinois Chicago Undergraduate Division, we found approximately 6 per cent had sufficient archival value to warrant transfer to the University Archives.

Indifference to modern procedures for the creation and maintenance of records produces archival material of poorer quality and greater quantity. Gradually, universities will follow the federal government, state governments, and industry in becoming concerned about the cost of records making and records keeping. Until then, the university archivist will have difficulties in arousing interest in the efficient handling of paper work. Most university offices are characterized by peaks of activity and lulls. Data processing, preregistration, and the 12-month school year relieve but do not eliminate these cycles. Factors like the 25 per cent annual turnover in the academic community also distinguish us from other major producers of archival material. Despite these important differences, we can profit from the archival literature produced by government agencies.

Official records should be obtained under a routine, orderly process of transfer from active office files or inactive storage areas to the university archives. This may be done by records disposal schedules or by informal agreement between the archivist and the

custodian of the records. The archivist's goal should be a records disposal schedule for each university office. Practical limitations on his time, the degree of compliance and standardization that the administration will insist upon and the repetitive nature of scheduling offices may force him to identify files having archival value and allow the Business Office general schedule and the office administrators to decide retention periods for other record series. The one man archives may need an alternative to scheduling and the time-consuming inventory leg work of records analysts or self-inventories. In visiting an office, I contact the secretary or department head, make a quick inventory, indicate which types of records probably have archival value, which types may be destroyed when legal and financial retention requirements are met and leave a letter from the President's Office outlining a transfer procedure. If possible, the procedure should involve clean chronological file breaks. The archivist should avoid the "dribble system" where custodians of important files send a folder to the Archives whenever they decide it is more "historical" than "administrative." He should also avoid the system reported by a department head in 1924, "Unfortunately when closet room gives out, some unerudite and dirty-handed person will have to consign to the flames all but the worthwhile—and his judgment may not be good." Another peril is the official historian who regards his appointment as a letter of marque to raid the office files for items of historical value.

Among the largest producers of paper work in a university are the administrative and business offices. Their records are most suitable for scheduling. They pose a problem for the archivist in that the processor needs skills in bookkeeping and filing systems to understand why and how these records were created. Many manuscript and archival collections remain unprocessed for the lack of such skills. Another area which produces many records in the modern university is the area of science and technology. Although the archivist may be better prepared to handle records produced by the social sciences and humanities, he should develop procedures and criteria for the identification, selection, and transfer of scientific records.

Faculty papers should be collected by the archivist. Most senior faculty members are of sufficient importance that their literary remains should be preserved. In all cases, basic processing should be undertaken. It is often advisable to accept faculty papers on a piecemeal basis and agree to return unwanted documents to the donor. The archivist should guard against acquiring too many collections of men in one area or discipline or which represent a highly specialized field.

Faculty papers may include several unique types of records. The reminiscence may take four forms:

1. Written collections prepared by the faculty member to document his career.
2. Commentaries written to explain groups of documents relating to special interests or projects.
3. Marginal notes constituting contemporary or ex post facto opinions on the documents.
4. Oral history, recorded or summarized by the interviewer on magnetic tapes or disks.

The archivist should welcome reminiscences in striving to secure maximum documentation for important activities. He should take care that the reminiscences do not impair the integrity of existing files or serve as substitutes for contemporary documents. Written recollections by emeritus faculty have proved very useful in our Archives. Many departmental histories probably belong in this category. Commentaries are preferable to marginalia and both should be dated and signed. A tape recorded interview is preferable to the interviewer's notes on a conversation, but both should be preserved.

A productive oral interview is the result of skillful selection of a suitable person to be interviewed, careful preparation by the interviewer, tact, timing, and courtesy. I favor an informal interview beginning from a series of questions submitted in advance. The questions help the person interviewed prepare and demonstrate the sincerity and interest of the interviewer. Pictures may help to keep an interview moving.

Accessioning

A procedure for accessioning archival material should be as simple as possible. It should be effective, but with a minimum of controls. In the case of departmental records, a note as to the date and office of origin should be kept. For faculty papers, the Archive needs a record of the date and source of the documents. For publications, it is generally not necessary to keep a precise record of the date of accessioning, as the material usually comes from the office of publication shortly after the publication date shown on the documents. For small lots of photographs, we enter the date and source on the back of the print copy. Field notes are a convenient means for recording the date and origin of archival materials received.

Classification & Arrangement

Archival material is classified by source, rather than by subject. This basic difference from library material is founded on the

principle of provenance. Provenance dictates that material is filed according to its origin, so that it will explain the functions of that office. The sources of college or university records are the offices that create or file records. We have designated sixty administrative units as record groups or primary organizational units. These record groups are grouped together as major administrative offices, colleges, institutes, auxiliary services, and other campuses. Typical record groups are the Board of Trustees, President, Provost, Comptroller, eleven colleges, three institutes and major service offices like Alumni Association, Extension, Physical Plant, and Student Affairs.

We have about 377 sub-groups or secondary organizational units. Typical sub-groups are bureaus, divisions, departments, and the offices of deans or directors.

Our classification guide lists record groups and sub-groups and gives a brief administrative history of each. It is the equivalent of an organization chart and provides the first two numbers of the three number record series classification.

A record series or file is a group of records or documents having a common arrangement and a common relationship to the functions of the office that created them. The record series are arranged within sub-groups in order from general to specific. Proceedings, minutes, or subject files may be assigned number one. Housekeeping records, special files, and files of subordinate administrative units may be numbered from three to nineteen. Numbers beginning at twenty have been reserved for private papers. We add a fourth number-0-to indicate published materials. Our record series range in size from single documents in envelopes to 100 cubic feet.

In determining the existing arrangement of a record series, the archivist will generally find that it is arranged alphabetically, numerically, or chronologically. He should avoid revising or rearranging the order of records received. If the file comes in good order, it should be processed and kept in the original order. If the file comes in disorder, but with reasonably complete and accurate subject headings on the folders, it should be processed and arranged alphabetically by subject. If private papers or organizational records come in a mess—no definition required—, they should be processed and arranged in chronological order—unless the volume of material and the subjects covered lend themselves to classification and arrangement by subject. Under no circumstances would I create an arrangement alphabetically by correspondent when the person who filed the records had not done so. A series of recent articles in library publications have shown an unfortunate tendency to emphasize rearrangement of papers in archival collections and manuscripts. To provide certain self-indexing features, this is sometimes done by arranging incoming correspondence in alphabetical order and outgoing

correspondence in chronological order. Other novice archivists have not only rearranged their materials, but have segregated correspondence by the quantity of letters from various individuals and prepared elaborate card indexes to large collections. Frequently the proponents of these ideas have attended basic archival courses and show a firm grasp of control by record group, sub-group and series, but proceed to violate basic archival principles of arrangement at the filing unit or document level.

Processing

Processing is an extension of appraisal. It is dependent on the knowledge acquired during the appraisal process. The same person should do both. The key to successful processing is the constant application of techniques, while carefully measuring your time. Processing involves boxing for transfer, unpacking, cleaning, unfolding, removing paper clips and rubber bands, stapling, taping damaged documents, sorting, destroying duplicate and unwanted material, replacing torn or brittle folders, adding legible folder captions and inclusive dates, boxing, and labeling. On an uninterrupted day, an archivist can effectively process about five cubic feet of faculty papers.

Processing photographs presents problems arising from the small lots, glass plates, subject classification, and poor identification of source, date, location, and subject. We do not change the existing order of photographic record series. Due to the kinds of subjects photographed and the uses made of photographs, we have developed a standard subject classification system for photographic material. This system is used for the central filing of small lots of photographs given to the archives, and extra prints of plates, negatives, or prints in regular record series. The standard subject classification will also be used for a card index to prints and negatives where no extra prints are available. It may also be used for photographic record series when no existing arrangement is discernible.

For archival collections, use acid-free folders obtainable from many manufacturers of filing supplies. When processed and ready for filing in the archives, records may be stored in fibredex documents cases, similar to those manufactured by the Hollinger Corporation, or in 10''x12''x15'' cardboard record center type boxes. These boxes are obtainable from most commercial box manufacturers. They may be obtained with or without handholds in the end, lids, or interlocking bottoms and tops. Small boxes and envelopes are used for material occupying less than the four lineal inches which a fibredex documents case will accomodate. There should be no necessity for flat filing, except in the instance of very rare or fragile documents.

Letterbooks and 8-1/2'' x 11'' publications should be housed in boxes, rather than bound or rebound.

A neat and attractive label is important in locating records and maintaining the appearance of the archives. The archival agency should be identified in printing on a gummed label. The following information should be typed on the label: record group, sub-group, series title and inclusive dates, box contents (A-K, 1950-53, Correspondence), series number, and box number.

Housing

The type of shelving to be used in a university archives should be determined by the boxes. It is not necessary to have easily adjustable shelving. The shelving should be 40 inches wide, 12 or 27 inches deep depending upon whether one or two boxes are to be accommodated, and as high as space will permit considering the location of the ceiling beams and lights, air circulation and accessibility.

The archival storage area should be laid out for maximum storage space. The archivist will never have enough storage space to accommodate the records that should be preserved. He and the librarian will share a basic greediness for space. After maximum provision is made for storage, the archivist should use the balance of his area for three other functions: processing, reference, and office space.

Description

The archivist should concentrate on accurate description of materials which he processes. He should write down all pertinent data as he processes the records. This includes inclusive dates on each box, a general narrative description and evaluation of the contents, notes on significant letters and documents, information on the type of material to be found in the series, information about the reason for the record's creation or evidential value and information as to its subject matter content or informational value. The notes of the processor should be organized and typed as a supplementary finding aid for the records series. From these notes it is possible to prepare an inventory work sheet (see Fig. 1) or summary description of the contents of the record series. The inventory work sheet may also be prepared on records in the office prior to transfer to the university archives.

INVENTORY WORK SHEET
FORM L-A-1

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
ROOM 19, LIBRARY

Date ~~Received~~ Inventoried October 22, 1964 — Classification Number 35/3/2

RECORD SERIES	COLLEGE OR ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT
Departmental File	Library
DATES	DEPARTMENT OR OFFICE
1963-	Public Services, University Archives
VOLUME	SOURCE OF MATERIAL
1.5	University Archives
ANNUAL ACCUMULATION	OFFICE LOCATION (BUILDING, ROOM NUMBER)
1	Room 19, Library
NUMBER AND SIZE OF FILES, DRAWERS OR DOCUMENTS	REPRESENTATIVE (NAME, TITLE AND PHONE)
1 lettersize file drawer	M. J. Brichford, University Archivist, 3-0798

DESCRIPTION (TITLE, TYPE OF MATERIAL, NATURE AND DATES OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF CREATING OFFICE OR OFFICER, SUBJECTS COVERED, DUPLICATION, MISSING OR PURGED MATERIAL)

Departmental file maintained by the University Archives for use in inventorying, collecting, processing and servicing records transferred to its custody under Faculty Letter #68, Nov. 29, 1963, including folders on each sub-group or secretary's university office containing:

1) typewritten field notes on conversations with faculty, administrators and secretaries about records and recollections relating to the development of teaching, research and service at the University;

2) correspondence with offices and individuals concerning official records, faculty papers and publications;

3) supplementary finding aids and lists containing additional information concerning subject content and dates of records series listed in the University Archives Records Control File;

4) published and reproduced material about the functions of offices and careers of faculty;

5) related material.

ARRANGEMENT

numerical by record group classification number and numerical by sub-group classification number thereunder.

INDEX, FINDING AIDS OR FILE GUIDES

University Archives Classification Guide lists numbers & contains brief administrative history.

RETENTION PERIOD

2M—10-63—81725-K

INVENTORY WORK SHEET
Figure 1.

I believe that the freedom of a narrative description is preferable to an inventory work sheet that contains a large number of fill-in boxes. I am equally convinced that the archival processor should follow a standardized format in preparing a work sheet for transcription to a record series control card. Insistence on this uniform phrasing of the description has earned the lasting enmity of my

INSTRUCTIONS

A records series or file is a group of records or documents having
(1) a common arrangement and
(2) a common relationship to the functions of the office that created them.

Be specific in listing records series. Do not lump several together as "Miscellaneous Financial Records", "Routine Correspondence Files" or "Ledgers". Also, do not list forms as records series unless the form listed is the only document in the file.

RECORDS SERIES
A short familiar title, descriptive of informational content of the file.

DATES
Inclusive dates of documents. If an active record, omit the final date e.g. 1955-

VOLUME
Total cubic feet (1 1/2 for letter size drawer, 2 for legal size, 1 for 10,000 tab cards, 1/4 for a 12" 5 x 8 card file, 1/10 for a 12" 3 x 5 card file)

ANNUAL ACCUMULATION
For most recent year in cubic feet.

SOURCE OF MATERIAL
Complete only if the record series does not come from the office which created it, e.g. records collected or held in private hands.

DESCRIPTION
Alternative titles and form numbers preceded by modifying information (e.g. duplicate mimeograph copies of monthly summaries of...) and followed by a concrete noun e.g.

applications	inventories	payrolls	schedules
bills	journals	photographs	statements
bonds	ledgers	plans	summaries
books	lists	proceedings	surveys
cases	maps	receipts	vouchers
claims	notes	releases	warrants
correspondence	notices	reports	worksheets
decisions	orders	requests	

Information explaining why the record is found at its present location, "submitted by" or "sent to" another office, i.e. its procedural significance.

Reference to Univerality Statutes or General Rules.

Description of information or documentation contained in the record series.
1. Single Form - "showing" followed by a list of entries.
2. Files - "including" or "containing" followed by a list of documents.
3. Correspondence and Subject Files - "relating to" or "concerning" followed by a list of significant subjects.

Supplementary data showing any previous disposals, federal and office internal audits, or any other data pertinent to a determination of the minimum retention period.

ARRANGEMENT
Chronological, alphabetical, numerical or by status (active or inactive). Also list secondary and tertiary arrangements thereunder.

RECOMMENDATION
Give the number of years the record series must be retained in active office space for administrative, fiscal or legal reference.

INVENTORY WORK SHEET
Figure 1.

graduate student assistants and other writers, but it has produced readily understandable descriptions which may be copied to produce a guide. The instructions on the back of the inventory work sheet contain the basic formula. Start with the title or titles modified by information about the type of document, means of production, and

frequency of issuance. Follow with a statement concerning the procedural significance of the record. State why it was created or filed in this location and cite requirements in statutes or regulations. This forms the basis for a judgment of the evidential value of the record series. At this point, I begin a series of adverbial clauses beginning with "including," "containing," "concerning," "relating," "showing," and "about" which lead to statements about the contents of the record series, the format of the documents it contains and the significant subjects covered. The processor's work notes should indicate the most significant subjects. They should also refer to important documents, correspondents, and dates. Explanatory notes relating to other record series, indexes, gaps, and duplication should follow. Our record series control card (see Fig. 2) provides the basic control over processed material and is consulted first by researchers. It has twenty-one lines for a narrative description of the series.

RECORD GROUP — UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES CONTROL CARD · FORM L-A-2 — DATE RECEIVED

Liberal Arts and Sciences — 12/19/63 and 5/21/64

SUB-GROUP — LOCATION

Zoology

ARRANGED — VOLUME

by type of material and chronologically thereunder — 2

DESCRIPTION

Papers of Victor E. Shelford, professor of Zoology (1914-1946), including correspondence, reports, publications and statements relating to plant, animal and aquatic ecology; scientific meetings, lectures and papers; field trips and studies; editing and securing contributions for publications (1924-56); the organization, development, membership and functions of the Ecological Society of America and its committees (1937-45); preservation of natural areas as sanctuaries for the ecological study of biotic and animal communities; the political involvement of ecologists in preserving natural areas; grasslands areas and the Grasslands Research Foundation (1931-58); wildlife management research (1935-54); the University Committee on Natural Areas and Uncultivated Lands (1946-49); animal populations and solar radiation (1947-53); a proposed plant and animal life sciences building (1952-55) the history of ecology (1955-61) and the scientific contributions of Shelford and his students. The scientific contributions are reprints of articles by Shelford (4 vols., 1906-46) and his students (5 vols., 1912-46).

RECORD SERIES CONTROL CARD
Figure 2.

If additional information must go on a supplementary finding aid, we note this on the control card. The finding aid is placed in the appropriate sub-group folder in a nearby filing cabinet. A primary finding aid reflects the arrangement of the record series and usually takes the form of a box list, showing the dates, subjects covered, and significant documents. For important series, it may be a folder label listing, which extends control about as far as an archivist can afford to go. Because archival records are filed by source, secondary finding aids may be required for archival material. It is frequently necessary to make relative indexes or lists of subjects that are treated in various record series or filing units. The modern archivist does not prepare 3"x5" card indexes to his holdings.

The archivist should publish supplemental information, such as lists of topics which may be developed from materials in the archives, special subject lists, manuscript guides, and other documents which will assist the researcher in locating information on his subject. He should impress upon serious researchers the importance of discussing possible source material with him. He should be a consultant capable of guiding researchers through the masses of modern documentary source materials. He should promote and improve the uses of his material by scholars.

I will close with two quotations from the faculty letter announcing our program:

"As an institution of higher learning, the University of Illinois has a responsibility to the academic community and to the public for the preservation of records containing evidence and information with respect to its origins and development and the achievements of its officers, employees and students. The University is equally concerned with preserving material of research or historical value and assisting its administrative and academic officers by relieving their offices of inactive records, eliminating records that need not be preserved, and providing space and custody in the University Archives for material that should be preserved."

"The University Archivist will:

1 - Decide if material no longer needed by the office of origin should be preserved in the Archives;
2 - Classify and arrange such records and material as may be transferred to his care for permanent preservation and keep the same accessible to all persons interested, subject to proper and reasonable rules and restrictions as he may find advisable;
3 - Process transferred material to destroy duplicates and other items that do not have sufficient evidential or informational value to warrant their continued preservation;

4 - Advise, upon request, concerning standards, procedures, and techniques required for the efficient creation, use, and destruction of University records."

There is no easy way to meet these important responsibilities. The appraising and processing of archival material requires hand work and experience. Its expense is justifiable only if your institution recognizes that it has an obligation to document and to preserve a record of its contributions to society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Appraisal

American Institute of Physics. "Notebooks, Correspondence, Manuscripts: Sources For the Fuller Documentation of the History of Physics." New York, 1963.

Bauer, G. Philip. "The Appraisal of Current and Recent Records," The National Archives Staff Information Circulars, 13:1-25, June 1946.

Brichford, Maynard. "Preservation of Business Records," History News, 11:77, Aug. 1956.

Gilb, Corinne L. "Tape-Recorded Interviewing: Some Thoughts From California," The American Archivist, 20:335-344, Oct. 1957.

Harvard University. "The Harvard University Archives" (Guides to the Harvard Libraries, No. 4), Cambridge, 1957.

Lewinson, Paul. "Archival Sampling," The American Archivist, 20:291-312, Oct. 1957.

Lewinson, Paul. "Toward Accessioning and Standards—Research Records," The American Archivist, 23:297-309, July 1960.

Mood, Fulmer, and Carstensen, Vernon. "University Records and Their Relation to General University Administration," College and Research Libraries, 11:337-345, Oct. 1950.

Schellenberg, T. R. "The Appraisal of Modern Public Records," Bulletins of the National Archives, 8:1-46, Oct. 1956.

Woolf, Harry. "The Conference on Science Manuscripts," ISIS, 53:3-157, March 1962.

Classification & Arrangement

Holmes, Oliver W. "Archival Arrangement; Five Different Operations at Five Different Levels," The American Archivist, 27:21-41, Jan. 1964.

National Archives. "The Control of Records at the Record Group Level," The National Archives Staff Information Circulars, 15:1-12, July 1950.

National Archives. "Principles of Arrangement," The National Archives Staff Information Papers, 18:1-14, June 1956.

National Archives. "Archival Principles: Selections From the Writings of Waldo Gifford Leland," The National Archives Staff Information Papers, 20:1-13, March 1955.

Schellenberg, Theodore R. "Archival Principles of Arrangement," The American Archivist, 24:11-24, Jan. 1961.

Processing

Kane, Lucile M. "A Guide to the Care and Administration of Manuscripts," Bulletins of the American Association for State and Local History, 2:333-388, Sept. 1960.

Minogue, Adelaide E. "Physical Care, Repair, and Protection of Manuscripts," Library Trends, 5:344-351, Jan. 1957.

Housing

Rieger, Morris. "Packing, Labeling, and Shelving at the National Archives," The American Archivist, 25:417-426, Oct. 1962.

Description

Evans, Frank B. "The State Archivist and the Academic Researcher,—'Stable Companionship'," The American Archivist, 26:319-321, July 1963.

National Archives. "The Preparation of Preliminary Inventories," The National Archives Staff Information Circulars, 14:1-14, May 1950.

U. S. Library of Congress. The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, 1959-1961. Ann Arbor, Mich., J. W. Edwards, 1962.

CONSERVATION

Harold W. Tribolet

Librarians and archivists face a great number of administrative problems: personnel, building programs, heating, air-conditioning, trustees, and so on. This discussion adds a new dimension—conservation—to their problems. Many of the points touched upon will not help specifically in handling the tons of day-to-day materials charged to their care, but they will consider the hazards of disintegration and the techniques of preservation of rarities.

At one time conservation was a pure craft, and still is more or less; however, today the craft and the science of conservation have merged. With this merger, we now have a more positive solution to the complex problems of adding years to the life of important material of the past and of the present.

Strangely, many of the early conservators were very secretive about their techniques; they were not inclined to share their knowledge; and too much emphasis was placed on the tradition of the craft. Amusing stories about techniques and formulas have been passed down from one generation to the next. An example of such a story involves the simple operation of oiling leather bindings. One man proudly told that his Grandfather had always used banana peels to furnish leather bindings, and he said: "There is nothing better." This man supported an unproved and questionable technique, and ignored the scientists who have proposed other solutions for leather preservation. The story is typical of those passed on from one generation to another. In most instances, they have done no good and in many cases they have done harm.

The eight factors which cause disintegration are: heat, light, air, moisture, insects, other materials, inherent characteristics, and people.

Objects stored in attics or in areas where there is excessive heat disintegrate much faster than do those items that have been stored under ideal conditions. In fact, conservationists use heat to make accelerated age tests.

Materials exposed to sunlight fade and become dehydrated. Fluorescent and incandescent lighting as well as reflected natural light also cause objects to show early signs of disintegration.

Harold W. Tribolet is Manager, Extra Bindery, The Lakeside Press, R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co., Chicago, Illinois.

Fortunately, it is possible to retard the injurious effect of light with controlled illumination and light filters.

Some people believe that air promotes the life of paper; however, this is not true. Many of the objects that have lasted best have been preserved in book form under compression. The Gutenberg Bible is a good example of this. Copies of the book that are not exhibited are in better condition than those frequently exposed to the atmosphere, much of which is polluted to some degree.

Paper exposed to excessive moisture for prolonged periods frequently suffers from destructive mildew or unsightly foxing.

The ravages caused by insects around a library are so well known that there is no need to elaborate upon them.

By "other materials" we mean the migration of injurious acids from one material to another. As an illustration, a short time after a newspaper clipping is placed inside a book, a discoloration--acid damage—becomes evident on the adjoining leaves. The bad material, in this case the newspaper clipping, always affects the good material, and the migratory action is never in the other direction.

The inherent characteristics of the objects to be preserved are important. If poor materials are involved, a short life span can be expected unless ideal storage conditions are provided. Good materials have a better chance of survival under adverse conditions, but they, too, will respond favorably in a suitable environment.

People create a number of hazards through poor handling of items, often a result of pure ignorance. The simplest illustration is the extensive way in which pressure-sensitive plastic tape has been used to repair damaged paper during the last decade or so.

Let us suppose that we have a sheet of early eighteenth-century paper that shows signs of bad handling: torn margins, water spots, and applications of pressure-sensitive plastic tape. Assuming that the image is on one side of the paper, it would be possible to adhere a piece of thin mulberry tissue to the back of the piece of paper to support it. This provides physical support for the weakened fibers. An operation of this kind requires paste and many conservationists consider old-fashioned wheat paste the best. Suitable support for the damaged sheet of paper could also be provided with a piece of all-rag, chemically-safe paper. Silk chiffon is sometimes used. This material, however, has limitations which are determined by the adhesive, and the chemical characteristic of the paper to which it is being applied. For example, a piece of paper which is highly acidic will cause disintegration of silk chiffon much earlier than all-rag paper which is chemically safe. Silk chiffon is nevertheless considered a good supporting fabric where transparency is essential.

In handling a recent restoration involving a historically-important insurance policy, which had been reduced to hundreds of

irregular pieces of paper by broken glass, silk chiffon was selected as the best supporting material. It was possible to paste the many fragments and slide them into correct position on the silk, making the document whole and strong.

Other materials which successfully support paper are cotton, linen, and a relatively new material known as polyester web, a matted mylar fiber that has been found to be most useful in supporting folding maps, for it is very strong in relation to its thickness. All of the bonding problems involving mylar fiber have not been solved; however, the material is worthy of further experimentation.

When a broadside, drawing, or similar sheet of paper requires mounting or hinging to a rigid support, an all-rag fiber board should be used rather than a board made of impermanent fiber. Poor board liberates acids that migrate to the paper placed against it, causing discoloration and disintegration.

If a mounted piece is to be displayed in a frame, it is advisable to provide a mat, also made of all-rag board. The mat will keep the item away from the surface of the glass on which moisture will sometimes form under certain atmospheric conditions. A piece of moisture-proof material should be applied to the back of a framed piece, attached to the wooden molding, to prevent the penetration of moisture through the back surface. A great number of framed documents and drawings have been ruined or damaged from moisture absorbed from a wall, especially an outside wall, and from excessively humid air.

When both sides of a paper object are to be protected and displayed, it can be supported within a contour mat, then placed between two sheets of Plexiglas UF1, a clear plastic formulated to give protection against injurious light rays, both natural and artificial. Although Plexiglas will break, it does not splinter as glass does. The National Gallery of Art in Washington, D. C., recently installed this material over its skylight glass to diminish the light problem. This plastic should not, however, be placed over an unfixed pastel, for static electricity may develop and cause the chalk to loosen.

Paper that is badly worn, weak, and on the fringe of total disintegration can be deacidified, then laminated between thin plastic film and tissue. In this process heat and pressure combine the materials into one unit. If a book is involved, the leaves are taken from the binding, laminated, then rebound, usually in a new cover, for the thickness of the paper is increased by the lamination.

Experimental work in this country and in Europe is attempting to perfect a deacidification process that can be applied to the leaves of books that do not require lamination or rebinding. It is a difficult problem, for the chemical vapors that are most beneficial to the paper cause a warp to develop in the leaves, especially when the grain of the paper is horizontal. When the technique is perfected, and it

probably will be, it will extend the life span of millions of books at a very low cost.

Many paper objects—books, broadsides, etchings, prints—that have developed stains can be bleached with liquid chemicals. Special care must be taken in handling wet paper and, of course, the chemicals must be mild. In most instances the washed paper is sized with gelatin and dyed to bring it back to its natural color. H. J. Plenderleith, formerly with the British Museum Research Laboratory, recommends Chloramine T as a safe chemical for the washing process. This chemical must be washed out of the paper before the job is considered finished. When washing, sizing, and tinting an object, one's aims should be the retention of the original characteristics of the paper, whether it be a book, broadside, or other paper object. The indentations in a printed piece should not be removed; this can be accomplished by pressing the wet paper when it is about 99 per cent dry between soft white blotting paper.

Simple tears in paper can be repaired with mulberry tissue or cotton fibers, applied with wheat flour paste. Avoid the handy pressure-sensitive plastic tape, for it is not a suitable material when permanence is a factor. A sophisticated restoration can be accomplished by the addition of a matching paper to an incomplete piece of paper. In this process, fibers are pulled from the old and new pieces of paper, then pasted together. If a laid paper with obvious chain marks is being treated, the chain marks of the two pieces of paper should be aligned.

Paper pulp, prepared by cooking paper scraps, then balling them, and finally mixing them with water before application, is a good material for repairing small holes, such as worm holes and perforations. Another way of repairing perforated paper is to perforate an identical piece of paper with the same type of machine which was used for the original perforation. The little circular pieces of paper punched out can then be mixed with thin paste and pressed into the holes of the paper being restored by means of a dental tool. This type of restoration is better for antique paper than smooth, modern paper.

If a book lacks a leaf, a simple facsimile can be installed, using a photograph or a photostat made from a complete copy of a similar book. A better solution is a Xerox reproduction, made on paper that resembles the paper in the book. The most sophisticated kind of a facsimile requires an engraving, made from a photograph of an original leaf, ink carefully mixed to match, and finally an impression on the correct paper. Since such a facsimile could lead to deception, it is advisable to stamp or print the word "FACSIMILE" in the gutter margin.

Although all facsimiles are not identified as such, they should be. In trying to identify facsimile pages in a book, the following steps should be taken:

1. Examine each leaf against a strong light to determine if the chain marks or other characteristics of paper are identical.
2. Using your fingers or a guage, check all leaves to determine if they are abnormally thick or thin.
3. With a magnifying glass, examine the edges of the leaves and observe the marks left by the cutting blade of the gulliotine cutter. Any leaves that have been added will not have identical serrations, because they were cut with another knife.
4. Turning the pages of the book, look for particles of dirt or migratory stains—the fly speck or foxing marks—that transfer from one page to another. If the marks are not visible on the opposite page, then it is probable the clean page is a facsimile or one that requires further examination.

Vellum is the most independent and probably the most permanent of the materials used for the leaves of books, book covers, broadsides, diplomas, and similar documents. Very little can be done or needs to be done to lengthen its life; however, in some instances it must be flattened or repaired. If a sharp crease or fold must be eliminated, the vellum is moistened or humidified, then drum-stretched on a flat surface with weights around the edges. Never use a steam-iron to solve this problem! If a void has to be filled, a piece of similar vellum can be bonded into position. If a tear must be repaired, stitches with suturing-gut will provide the desirable strength.

A sympathetic restoration of existing binding materials is desirable, to be sure, but in some cases there is not enough of the original material to save or it is entirely gone. In such instances, a period style or replica binding can be applied. To illustrate this point, the rare first illustrated edition of The Canterbury Tales came to us in an inadequate binding applied during the last century. After the leaves were repaired and sewn in the style of the fifteenth century, wooden boards were laced to the cords of the raised bands, and a calfskin cover was applied. In the manner of the period of the book, all details of reconstruction were kept deliberately crude, the tooling of the leather was irregular, and finally the leather was discolored and rubbed.

Most of the leather used for binding and restoration work is tanned in Europe, where great emphasis is put on the longevity of the skins produced. The best skins are vegetable tanned in the traditional way, are free of injurious acids, and are treated with a protective salt to resist the effect of the polluted atmosphere. Although vegetable tannage is excellent and is easily manipulated, it does have an affinity

for the acids in the air. On the other hand, chrome tanned leather does not have this weakness, but it is difficult to form and tool. One English tanner is now doing a combination tannage which may be superior to the traditional process.

Although little can be done to preserve cloth bindings, apart from putting them into protective cases, leather binding must be treated periodically with preparations that have been found to be beneficial. The initial treatment involves application of a solution of potassium lactate then, after this has dried, a mixture of neat's-foot oil and lanolin. Currently this dual treatment appears to be the best. We hope, however, the scientists will eventually develop a single, all-purpose solution to protect leather from polluted air, insects, and mold. Cleansed air, controlled humidity, and an even temperature are, of course, important elements in the preservation of leather.

Vellum bindings will not benefit from any preparation known today. The material can, however, be cleaned with an eraser or a damp cloth with saddle soap.

Since all of us are only temporary custodians of the things we possess or have under our control, it is important that we recognize the serious responsibility of preserving the objects of the past. Preservation alone may suffice in some instances and restoration in others. It is a decision that is not always easy, but we are obligated to know and understand what can be done.

THE REFERENCE USE OF ARCHIVES

Clifford K. Shipton

In this paper the archivist's obligations to his clientele; administrative, scholarly, and other will be discussed, and archivists will be warned of the pitfalls into which we in Cambridge have fallen.

There is no question that the bread and butter clientele of a university archive is the administrative officer. Recently there came to my desk, detoured by the congestion of the regular channels, a request for a certain folder from the Comptroller's files for the year 1962/63. We started a boy to the depths of our storage space while they started their office boy for our office. I trust that their paths intersected at the right time and place. This is, of course, records management, pure and simple, but it is the way in which we finance our archives. Some years ago President James B. Conant informed a meeting of administrators that the University budget would have to be cut, and said, "Taking the departments alphabetically, 'Archives'." At which two department heads whom I had never met personally spoke up and said, "You can't cut the Archives budget; it would cost us more to do the work which they are doing for us."

In most universities with which I am acquainted the archives program has obtained recognition and support only by offering records management service. To some historians, this seems to clutter up the fields of research. We once had a Director of the Harvard University Library who was a Pulitzer Prize winning historian, and, irritated at the demands of records management, he once told me that we should accept in the Harvard Archives only truly archival material, material worth permanent preservation. "All right," I said, "but you will have to inform all of these department heads that we can no longer service their records—they won't take it from me." He thought of that list for a moment, sighed, and said, "All right; how much space will you need for their records?"

We have tried various compromises to solve the space and service problem, such as giving keys to the storage space to the financial offices and telling them that they would have to service their records in our custody. That has not worked particularly well because, left to themselves, the administrative offices will send in their records in odd-shaped and slack-filled boxes which take up

---

The author is Custodian of the Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

entirely too much space. Our threat to repack their records at their expense has caused the worst offenders to reform. We are also thinking of charging the administrative offices rent for the shelving occupied by their non-permanent records in our custody. Faced with that proposal, I think that some of them will agree that the destruction schedules can be hastened.

Actually I should be very sorry to give over the records management service because of the opportunity which it gives me to observe the use of the material before I join in authorizing its destruction. To me there is something truly awful in having to make the decision as to what the historian of future generations is to know about this one. Obviously the decision should be made by someone with training and experience in historical research. I have known commercial records management services to recommend the destruction, as useless, of material of priceless historical value, actually protected by the statutes of the State. On the other hand, historians sometimes ask us to preserve material so bulky that any knowledge of records management costs demonstrates such a policy to be impractical.

Some university archivists have found their most serious problem that of convincing the administrative offices that they can be entrusted with confidential files. One university does not entrust its archivist with the minutes of its trustees, although they have in part been printed. In another university a dean is now proposing to destroy the student folder file because of the disciplinary material which it contains. If not destroyed, this file will be, a hundred years from now, the most frequently consulted segment of the archives.

So critical is this question of a student—and soon alumni—file in several universities that I am going to repeat what I have told a few of them of our experience at Cambridge. We have two files, each of which in theory contains a folder for every person who ever matriculated in the University. One is a public file of historical material which began in the alumni records office, and the other is a file of confidential records from the administrative offices. The public file contains ephemeral printed material, odd manuscript letters, and the fruits of clipping services. It certainly contains some odd material. In looking into the folder of a man of the Class of 1724 I found an annotation of the fact that 230 years after his graduation he had been sent a letter requesting that he verify his latest address.

The archival student folder file is quite another matter. When we set it up we found that over a period of twenty years some two dozen administrative offices had kept student folder files. On the average, every student in this period had folders in five different files—admissions, scholarships, the different deans, etc. So long as we kept these files intact as parts of the archives of the several

offices, servicing them was a troublesome matter. If, for example, a request came for the folder for a boy in the Class of 1914, we had to look on a chart to see which offices were keeping student folder files at that time. So we threw archival theory to the wind and combined all of these files into one.

Naturally, these archival student folder files are one of the most sensitive and confidential in our custody. I make a point never to look at the folder of anyone I know. No folder is ever delivered over the counter to the reading room. If an FBI agent asked to see one, I used to inspect it myself, answer his questions if reasonable, and in case of any doubt refer him to the Registrar. Of late years this subject has become so sensitive that we have referred all FBI questions to the appropriate administrative officers. One of these days we shall, without doubt, begin combining the older segments of these archival student folder files with the public alumni folder file. The most difficult decision which I ever had to make was in this field. Admission applications are, of course, a gold mine for historians. With their letters of recommendation and what is usually the first surviving literary effort of the applicants, they are most illuminating. However, at a time when our College was receiving ten times as many admission applications as it could accept, we had to decide that we could keep the records of only those who were admitted, and who came. It would have been just too costly to box and store the rejected applications until they could be made available to a generation of historians yet unborn. Without doubt an appreciable number of the biographical queries which come to us by mail could have been answered from this file, but we could not justify the cost of keeping and servicing this material.

Until we became deeply involved in the records management program, about half of the material in our department was historical rather than archival, and was readily available to any one who walked in and filled out an ordinary library use slip. For the most part this public material was classed in typical library manner and distinguished from strictly archival material by call number. The large majority of the questions asked about the past of the University and about its graduates can be answered from this material located through a typical library card catalog.

We have, however, committed the great heresy of interfiling with this catalog, reference cards locating essentially every individual mentioned, or subject discussed, in the first two hundred years of our archival material. Thus the indices to our archives are interfiled with the card catalogs of our historical collection—which has proved to be an eminently practical arrangement. Thus if you are interested in Mr. X you will find in the card catalog references to books and articles about him, if he is known chiefly for his Harvard connection,

and to the theses and prize papers which he wrote while a student. You will find the references to him in the Corporation Records, and will be given a good hundred-year-old transcript to inspect. You will find references in the Faculty Records, and will be given photostats. But if you want to use the Overseers' Records you will be questioned a little more closely, because we have no transcript of those. So, in effect, you will have ready access to everything in the Archives relating to a man who graduated before the Civil War.

This raises the question of how deeply a university should go into the preservation of the biographical material relating to its graduates, their published works, manuscripts, and association material. Our rule is that we shall keep the manuscripts of, and printed material relating to, men known chiefly for their Harvard connection. Fugitive material relating to most men will be dropped into their alumni folder files, but not material relating to John Adams or John Kennedy. Association material is almost never kept. No large institution can afford the effort and space required by a collection of the works of its graduates. Modern universities are so diverse that such a collection has no more significance than a collection of books by, say, red-headed men. At Cambridge we long ago had to abandon the effort to keep up a collection of books written by professors.

The ephemeral publications of the Faculty, the reprints of articles and the like, are a troublesome matter. For years we asked Faculty members to send us two copies of all such pamphlets, which we boxed temporarily. When the authors died, we bound these pamphlets up in two volumes, one of which went with their papers in the Archives, and one of which went to the library concerned with the subject matter of their work. Recently the flood of reprints from the men of science has made us review this system as too costly to be worth while. After all, these articles can be located in their original places of publication by use of the standard indexes.

Returning from this digression to the question of serving the administrative offices, I would like to point out that some of the records are unwritten and some of the service unrecorded. As you and I well know, many of the most important decisions in the history of an institution never do get into the records. Probably all private universities have an unwritten policy of establishing admission quotas by race, religion, or geography. The last is sometimes avowed, the others, never. Incoming presidents and deans need to know the history of such policies. At Harvard the Corporation keeps, besides its minutes, a record of "agreements and understandings" which are not regarded as being binding votes. Usually the archivist has a better historical perspective of university policy than administrative officers serving for short terms, so his knowledge of unrecorded agreements,

or the reasons for recorded ones, can be very useful. And this mean of course, that the archivist should have a faculty appointment so that he will be aware of the unrecorded winds of policy. In a small colleg it would be an ideal situation to have the archivist also secretary to the faculty and administrative boards, but of course these are full-time jobs in large universities. I have often thought that it would be desirable to separate the record-keeping function of the secretaries' offices from their other functions, and to designate the archivist to keep the records so that he may be aware of what is going on, but no one has warmed to the idea.

All academic bodies have a tendency to shatter into committees in which the most vital decisions are arrived at, and their records furnish the background of the bare formal votes of Trustees and Faculty. In Cambridge the committee records are a headache becaus of the habit of giving these bodies such ambiguous titles as Committe of Ten, or of Eleven, or of Twelve. The men who served on them wil think the archivist stupid because he does not remember what a particular committee was about. This has forced us to distinguish between the records of standing committees and those of the ad hoc committees. The former are arranged alphabetically in the archives of their parent departments, and the latter, chronologically within departments. The fact that in our confused Cambridge system a dozen bodies can spawn committees on the same subject has driven me to considering placing all ad hoc committee records in one chronological order, but this is just too heretical.

Curiously enough, the most frequent use of committee records has been in connection with law suits, particularly over university property. As these cases tend to be recurring, we can usually amaze each new generation of university lawyers by instantly putting the desired information in their hands in exactly the form which they want. We have never failed to produce evidence wanted by the University lawyers.

Each university archive will be asked to furnish various catch-all services for the administrative offices, and it is usually easier to perform them than to convince the offices that these are not archival functions. We keep, for example, for the Treasurer's Office files of presumably worthless stocks and bonds, which of course were inherited and never purchased by the Treasurer. From these files he occasionally extracts triumphantly a certificate for stocks or bonds of a corporation which has experienced a resurrection.

Sometimes the administration offices get curious ideas of the scope of our services. One day the Building and Grounds department telephoned me and enquired, "If we drive a well behind Dunster House will we find water?" I flipped off the shelf behind me a volume containing a map of Cambridge in 1630, and found that it showed a pond

in the place where Buildings and Grounds proposed to search for water. So I told them to go ahead, and they did so, not realizing that this service was unusual.

Once the department in charge of repairing art objects called up the Archives and asked for instructions regarding the disposition of the portrait of Governor William Stoughton, one of the key pieces in the history of American art. So I said, "send it to the Archives," where it hangs, one of several fine works of art sent to us by departments which were confused as to our archival functions.

So far as physical problems are concerned, the most troublesome office to serve is that of Buildings and Grounds. In the end, we assigned them a segment of the archives and told them to keep their own plans in order. In fact, no order is discernible to an outsider, but they find things. They are grateful for even the small service which we perform because of their experience when after the last war the University temporarily took over most of the buildings of Camp Devens for off-campus student housing. These were beautiful, solid brick and concrete buildings, with nary a plan to show where wires or pipes ran.

Considering the whole picture of the use of the Harvard Archives by administrative offices, it is obvious that the greatest number of reference services is in relation to such uninspiring things as cancelled checks. The use of their really archival material in our custody is relatively rare, except for the minutes of the Corporation. These are so active that the keeping of the index up-to-date is a matter of significance. Beyond this, research by the administrative offices is most frequently to determine the precise terms of former gifts. There is relatively little use of departmental correspondence except by the museums, which seem to be constantly losing objects. However, the museums tend to keep their correspondence for a hundred years, so they have most of the service problem.

The university archive is much more concerned than is the business, or even the government, archive, with finding facts or affording means of research for the public. The necessity of good public relations for the institution, the tradition that the university is a source of information, and the fact that it has a great roll of graduates in whom descendants and scholars are interested, drives the archive to give public service. One university president of my acquaintance set up the archive as a sort of record vault to his office, with a private stairway leading down to it; but other demands soon forced his archivist into offering the wide public services normal for such institutions.

In Cambridge, the first question of the public use of the archives came in June, 1747, when the town of Dunstable asked the Harvard Faculty for a transcript of the record of a young man recently ex-

pelled for good reason. The town had a legitimate interest in knowing why the student had been expelled, for it was considering settling him as its minister. The Faculty refused the transcript, refused to show the records to the Dunstable committee, and resolved that "the affairs committed to Writing in this Book [are not looked upon] to be records in any Respect, but only an Account of Various Things, as So many Memoranda to ourselves." Here is a curious forerunner of the "agreements and understandings" volume now kept by the Corporation. When the Faculty said that its minutes were not "records" it had in mind the New England concept of a public record to which the public had an inalienable right of access.

The most recent vote of the Harvard Corporation in regard to the use of its archives was to resolve that they were not maintained for the use of Jack Horners searching for Ph.D. thesis topics. The attitude of the Corporation has been made somewhat more charitable by the successful exploitation of the early financial records in the writing of economic history.

In spite of enunciated University policy, most of the use of the Archives for historical research has been by the public. Maynard Brichford, University Archivist, University of Illinois, in particular has raised the question of how far we should go in providing guidance and advice to these public users. No university archive was ever set up for this purpose, but no archivist can avoid the problem. It underlines the point that the archivist or the staff man making the contact with the public should have as much Ph.D. training as possible in order that he can give such advice. Frequently the archivist will have to decide that the would-be user may not have access to particular records. It may be because he is personally inadequate, as a school child wanting to use valuable manuscripts. Sometimes the scholarship of the would-be user is inadequate. Recently a man came in from another university, doing a Ph.D. dissertation on a subject on which, as I found by putting a few questions, he had not done the fundamental reading. There would have been no point in trying to help him, so I gave him the few items which he asked for, but refrained from telling him of masses of further material.

Sometimes the archivist who is a knowing historian can see that a proposed book cannot be written because the requisite material is not available. Surely he cannot refuse to give this warning. There have been times when the applicant shrugged off my warning, and I then felt that I had to refuse to make the material available because to do so would have been to waste the time of our staff. I do not think that any archivist is appointed just to be a vending machine, handing out whatever is indicated by the user. He has, I think, been appointed to exercise his discretion and to make use of his knowledge as an archivist. It is not an easy thing to make these unpleasant decisions

against applicants, but such a policy of discrimination is absolutely essential. The policy of offering service to the public can sometimes become costly for the archivist's employer. From time to time friends of mine teaching in other parts of the country will send their graduate students to New England to write their theses, and instruct them to look me up. The students show me their plans, and I say, "A good subject, but because the available source material is much greater than your professor thought, too wide for a thesis." Then I cut down the topic and area of research, and wind up guiding a Ph.D. dissertation which has nothing at all to do with my employer. I have greatly enjoyed these contacts, but I feel guilty about them.

Our general rule for making material available to the visiting scholar is as follows. If the number on his call slip is for an item in the historical collection attached to the archives he is shown it without question. If the call number is for archival material more than fifty years old, he fills out a special form for my eventual approval, but, subject to the discretion of the reading room attendant, he is immediately given the file which he wishes to see.

Correspondence for the period since 1909 is a special case. There are many applicants to use the correspondence of Presidents Charles W. Eliot and A. Lawrence Lowell particularly. Most of these requests are reasonable, but a few have the purpose of sensational, and distorted, exploitation of the material. The doubtful requests we sift out by insisting that the applicants record the purpose of their research on the application form. We get an occasional visitor who obstinately refuses to tell us why he wants to use the material, and him we must turn away.

Often we can save the applicant's time by ourselves looking at the files of restricted correspondence to see whether or not there is anything of interest to him. If there is, the applicant submits a formal request which, if I approve, is passed on to the Secretary to the Corporation, or to the literary heirs, as the case may be. I do not remember that any request which I approved professionally has ever been turned down. Sometimes when an incompetent person asks to use recent departmental archives, the department head gives me a sign that he wishes that I would find an archival excuse for turning down the request, since he does not wish to hurt the person's feelings. We never give anyone permission to make a general search of such collections of papers. Sometimes we tell the readers that we trust them not to read beyond the point already approved. Reasonable copying is allowed, but permission must be obtained to publish any quotation from this recent material.

The majority of the users of our reading room come to consult doctoral dissertations. As you know, the ancient theory in regard to such theses holds that the dissertation is the contribution to human knowledge by which a scholar has earned his degree, and is the

university's proof that he earned it. Obviously the thesis must be "published," in the sense of being made available to the public, to accomplish these purposes.

In my university a couple of the largest departments have the reprehensible habit of assigning the candidates topics which will take a lifetime of research, and of accepting as dissertations what are no more than preliminary studies of these topics. Obviously these theses cannot be made available to the public without running the risk of injury to the author's literary rights. Of course this prospect of injury is greatly exaggerated. Many a young author, fully believing that the library is full of lurking scholars ready to steal and publish his ideas, thus forestalling the publication of his Great Work, demands that we sequester his dissertation. Actually, such sequestration is usually more harm than protection to the authors. There are in Cambridge a few departments which play along with these shy authors by ruling that the theses cannot be consulted without the author's permission for a period of five years. This is a point on which authors are so sensitive that we do not make exceptions even when college presidents come in examing theses as a step in the hiring of the writers. There seems to be a certain fatality which dictates the fact that when some young Ph.D. disappears into the jungle, a college president immediately wants to see his thesis.

Many of the dissertations really are sensitive. Among those on our shelves are ones dealing with living politicians in foreign countries, and others reporting most unflattering surveys of American cities. One of these really got me into trouble, and I report the experience as a warning to other university archivists.

A request for the interlibrary loan of a certain thesis came via the President's office. Only this curious course caused me to look at the thesis. I found that it had to do with the habits of a certain social group in the South, and that its circulation had been originally restricted by the then head of the Department of Sociology. This restriction had run its five year course, but the professor who had placed it was not available to advise me. Since the loan request came from the president of a southern university, it seemed to me to be discreet to report that the thesis was restricted. The college president was not so easily discouraged, however. He flew up to Cambridge, walked into our reading room, asked for the thesis, and was handed it by the attendant, who noticed, correctly, that the restriction had run out. The president read the thesis, rubbed his hands gleefully when he had finished, and told the reading room attendant, "I'm going straight home and fire the author; he is one of my professors." And so he did. And so the author of the thesis threatened that he was going to sue me for having published it.

Had the author done so, it would have been an interesting case, for we inform all doctoral degree recipients that the University reserves the right to make available to the public, and to copyright, any thesis or prize paper still unpublished five years after the date of its acceptance. It is our custom to tell would-be poachers that the University reserves the copyright on all theses and prize papers, and, at times, fear of the University lawyers has thus protected this literary property.

For those of us handling this kind of literary property, the Copyright Law Revision Part 2. Discussion and Comments on Reports of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law just issued, offers little encouragement.[1] Apparently the doctoral candidate will still have to rely on Justice Joseph Story's definition of literary property, and his own reservation of copyright, or else have two extra copies of his thesis made to deposit for copyright registration. The law is anything but clear, so a university archivist may well find himself spending more time on the problem created by doctoral dissertations, if these are within his purview, than on any other one segment of his duties.

Indeed, the dissertations begin to trouble me before they are written. As the candidates think up new questions, we are called upon to revise the regulations for writing of theses. The dean's office long ago gave up trying to answer questions as to suitable paper, satisfactory methods of reproducing the texts, and even the kind of paste to be used in attaching the illustrations. Frequently a student will argue that the ribbon copy of his thesis must be destroyed in the duplicating process, and he will often maintain that only a certain, usually non-permanent, process, can be used for this or that reason. We find it very useful to have some very strict rules in print so that we can make a great point of concession when we want to distract the candidate's attention from some really important rule which we are enforcing. One mistake which we have made has been to permit the candidates to submit various kinds of electro-print copies for the first, or record, copies of their theses. We have found by sad experience that good microfilm copies cannot be made from many of these substitutes; that there is nothing like the first ribbon copy of a manuscript for making reproductions.

The specifications of the kind of paper on which dissertations are typed have given us great trouble. An examination of the theses which arrive in any lot show every kind of variation in the paper stock, most of them, I believe, honest errors made by the students in their interpretation of our specifications. The one way to obtain the use of a uniform paper of good quality is obviously to require the candidate to use a particular brand and weight, but no widely obtainable commercial brand has permanence, good folding strength,

and proper surface qualities. Last year the representative of the Crane Company of Dalton, Massachusetts, over the last century the most important manufacturers of bank note paper, suggested that they box a suitable standard paper for dissertations, and so label it. We agreed that the idea was good, and had their sample tested for acidity. The report shocked and horrified them. Protesting that we were making too much of acidity, they went to work and made up a special batch of thesis paper for us. Sent to Richmond for testing, this sample soon had the excited experts on the telephone, reporting that the paper was actually alkaline as well as having the best folding strength of any typewriting paper they had ever seen. I have used all of the commercially produced typewriter papers recommended by this laboratory, and Crane's new paper is much the best. It is not as erasable as Ph.D. candidates could wish, but the more erasable papers have much more serious drawbacks. Our present thinking is to have this paper marketed under the trade name Crane's Thesis Paper. Presumably any university can have its stock labeled with its own name.

The ordinary administrative office uses permanent and expensive paper for its letterhead, and any cheap and highly acid paper for the carbon copies to be kept in its own files. Our Harvard purchasing agent has several times told the departmental offices that it has good second sheet material available for them, but apparently many prefer to do their own purchasing and buy the second sheet stock on the basis of color. In our university, no one wants to issue orders, but I can see no other solution to the problem.

The inquiries which our Cambridge office receives by mail from the general public take up a great part of our time. All of the offices of the University have become accustomed to forwarding to us to answer all questions relating to the past of the University, to its graduates, and to American history. This is a significant public relations service on which office secretaries used to waste hours of time because they did not have the necessary knowledge and the tools to find the answers. So many of the questions are recurring that we keep an index relating to the most popular ones. We have developed a vast attic of odds and ends of irrelevant historical fact from which we can sometimes produce information with what appears to the uninitiated to be miraculous efficiency. I remember that once when Perry Miller chanced to remark that he could not find the correspondence of an obscure non-Harvard man on whom he was working, we remembered that it was printed in a rare genealogy. We gracefully accepted his lyrical published praise of our efficiency without telling him that this was just one of those happy accidents.

Many of these questions have no relation to Harvard at all, but we are in the best position to field inquiries relating, for example, to

witches and signers of the Declaration of Independence. Many people write to the President of Harvard University as a sort of historical oracle, asking questions on the most diverse subjects. Usually we can satisfy them. In our own offices we keep a small reference collection containing such commonly used works as the alumni catalogs of other universities and the publications of the New England Historic Genealogical Society, the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the Colonial Society of Massachusetts. On the floors below our offices in the Widener Library building are the collections of American genealogy and history from which we answer many questions quickly and painlessly. A few years ago when it was proposed to move the Harvard Archives to a building of their own some blocks away, I said that it was a fine idea from an administrative point of view, but that I would resign if it was carried out, because I would not want to have to give up the general reference service.

The most frequently asked of these mail-order questions is, "Did my grandfather go to Harvard?" Sometimes by asking for further information on grandfather, we can identify him as the graduate of another institution. Often we are asked to provide legal proof of citizenship, as in cases where a widow is trying to qualify for a pension. As birth records were not kept in some states before 1890, our admissions records have been most useful. Government offices and insurance companies have never refused to accept as legal evidence photostats of autograph documents in which a student recorded his date and place of birth and his parentage. Sometimes a graduate's correspondence with his class secretary has been used to establish his mental competence at a particular time.

Requests by relatives for student grades of a century ago call for considerable translating on our part to establish their significance. Requests for grades less than fifty years old we refer to the proper administrative office so that they can evaluate the legal responsibility involved. Sometimes when old grads ask for their own grades in order to impress later generations, they are shocked and deflated.

Scholars frequently ask for the records of the use of the library made by the men in whom they are interested. It is certainly a request which deserves service, and it can be met without too much difficulty for the period when the library was open for only a few hours a week, and the charging records were kept in a book. With the advent of charging cards, this type of material became too voluminous, so we authorized its destruction. If such records were available, we would have to duplicate the list of books charged out by John F. Kennedy.

For the early period of our history, we sometimes have requests for the costs of a student's education, or a statement as to who paid the bills. Although this kind of material is often significant for

seventeenth and eighteenth century graduates, I hope that this does not encourage you to inquire as to the cost of Henry Thoreau's education, certainly a legitimate question.

Questions relating to the history of the University, and as to the state of knowledge on curriculum subjects, are all legitimate, and can be classed only as reasonable, or unreasonable, possible, or impossible. We cannot, for example, undertake to discover the first impact of a book or of a particular concept in physics. When such requests require more research than we can put into them, we can usually satisfy the inquirer that this is so. In regard to the questions that have no relevancy to Harvard, we answer them if reference to one or two books in the general collection of the University Library will supply the answer. Actually, a majority of such questions are so easily answerable by anyone well acquainted with the source material and reference works of American history that it would be unreasonable not to put in twenty minutes or so of research.

Of course it is often difficult to draw the line between reasonable and unreasonable. One lady who was writing a club paper on the history of universities asked for a thumbnail sketch of mine. I replied, courteously I thought, referring her to a readily available source, but she replied in anger that all of the rest of the archivists had sent to her synopses of the histories of their universities, so she had simply omitted Harvard from the history of American higher education.

A particularly annoying group of requests come from grade school students who have been encouraged by their teachers to do research by writing in for general information on leading American figures. My staff, thinking that I am discourteous in throwing such letters in the wastebasket, now regularly intercept them and answer them politely. More troublesome are the professors in distant universities who assign to the members of their classes such topics as the speech-education of various nineteenth century literary figures. Of course such research could be carried out only in the archives of the universities in which those literary figures were educated. It would consume far more time than we would devote to even important queries.

We are sometimes asked by other university archivists what reference use statistics we keep. The answer is simple, practically none. We have kept them for short periods to see how we spent our time, but in general we have found that the useful information which we needed could be combed from charge slips and use-permission applications.

So far as I personally am concerned, there are two joys in the life of an archivist. The first is the bringing order out of chaos. After that, except for making decisions as to preservation, the work

of the archivist would be dull routine were it not for the function of finding the answers to the amazing questions asked sometimes by our administrators, but usually by the public.

REFERENCES

1. U. S. Copyright Office. Copyright Law Revision Part 2. Discussion and Comments on Reports of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U. S. Copyright Law. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

A SCHOLAR'S VIEW OF UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

Laurence R. Veysey

While working on "The Emergence of the American University, 1865-1910," for my doctoral dissertation in American history at the University of California at Berkeley, I visited the archives of eleven leading universities. My study was an investigation of major trends in thinking about the ideal nature of the university in this formative period of university education in America, and it was also a comparative look at the actual policies and practices of about a dozen leading academic institutions during this fast-changing span of time.

The word "comparative" should be emphasized. The aim was to see all, or almost all, of the major academic establishments side by side, to see what they had in common and in what respects certain of them might truly claim to be unique. It was for this reason that I had an unusually wide contact with university archives.

Many scholars in the past have gone through the archival material for one university, usually their own, and on the basis of it written a history of that particular university. This procedure has resulted in some very fine volumes of academic institutional history, although it has also sometimes resulted in the uninspired chronicles which we are all familiar with, the kind that are often produced for academic anniversaries. When using just one archive, however, the author of such a local history never really knows in what respects he is merely recording what was typical of almost any academic establishment at a certain point in time, or in what respects he is dealing with situations that are unusual and deserve to be singled out for major attention. To try to overcome this difficulty—the sense of handicap that comes from restricting oneself to any single institution, be it Harvard or be it a state teachers college—this speaker set out to use many archives. The experience provided a comparative view of American universities in the late nineteenth century and a similarly broad view of American university archives in the present day.

Before turning directly to the archives as a scholar happened to see them, it should be pointed out how the use of eleven archives, rather than one, contributed directly to a better understanding on my part of the American university in the late nineteenth century. The experience of using the eleven archives together taught me that it is

---

The author is a faculty member of the Department of History, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

extremely wrong to think of a university archive as relevant only to the history of the institution which happens to house it. For example, it is incorrect to think that the Yale University archive is relevant only to the history of Yale. Because incoming letters more often tend to be saved than do carbon copies of outgoing ones, the average collection of correspondence will tend to be richer in materials arriving from other locations than it will be in materials which reflect the activities of the home base. Now, of course, presidential files contain so much in the way of inter-office memoranda that it would be wrong to underestimate their richness for documenting the histories of their own institutions. But every archive will have wonderful "finds" in terms of letters relevant to the history of other universities. Thus, to name just one example, some of the best material on the University of California in the 1870's and 1880's exists in the form of letters to be found in the James B. Angell papers at the University of Michigan. And in the reverse direction, the George H. Howison papers at the University of California contain some of the most candid descriptions of the Harvard department of philosophy in the days of William James and Josiah Royce, simply because several graduate students at Harvard wrote back to Howison, their undergraduate mentor, with their impressions and observations of Harvard, since Howison was an entire continent away. Or, to take one more case, some of the most major documents in the Edward A. Ross academic freedom case of 1900, which involved the administration of Stanford University, are to be found today in the archives of Harvard, Columbia, Cornell, and, of course, the University of Wisconsin. This point should be rather obvious since all it means is that university presidents and professors were constantly writing to each other. But the result is that just about every major university archive should be combed by anyone doing a history of any other university. Or, to put it another way, each university archive is an extremely valuable depository of information, potentially at least, for every other major academic institution.

This fact has certain further consequences. For one thing, it means that unfavorable and controversial documents cannot be restricted or held from view nearly as easily as might otherwise be assumed. The university which restricts access to some of its own holdings cannot be assured that scholarly silence will result; instead, it must be prepared to accept the consequences of a history written on the basis of the materials which can be found at other archival locations. This material, by its nature, is often more gossipy and less fair to the institution's side of the story than is the material to which the institution is restricting access in its own archives. Thus the fact that incoming letters make all archives relevant to the history of all academic institutions means, in the first place, that there should be a reduced incentive on the part of any archive (or any academic

administration) to inhibit the use of its own archival material. To do so may only result in a poorer, more distorted history being written on the basis of the fascinating but partial material which is available in other locations.

But, secondly, the fact that no archive tells just one institution's story has another, more important consequence. It means that every university archive should be conceived as a depository of materials which are national, not local, in scope. There is a frequent tendency, illustrated perhaps most splendidly at Cornell, to link university archives with local or regional history. Often this is a thoroughly logical combination in terms of practical and budgetary considerations, and it is also true that much of the material in an academic archive does tend to have only a local value. But this is not the whole story, and in fact I am going to argue that this is not an archive's most important role. Again the incoming correspondence, which indeed may sometimes even be world-wide in scope, makes any academic archive a national institution. Every scholar, every professor is part of a national network of scholarship in his own area or discipline—indeed, especially in the sciences, part of a world network. Every administrator, every president is similarly part of a national network of academic institutions, public and private, which have all sorts of mutual ties and relationships. Even a memorandum which is purely local and intra-campus in its apparent scope may illustrate a method of handling a certain problem or of setting a policy on a basic matter which will strike the academic historian as having truly national significance. Or, to put this last point another way, both the similarities and the variations which purely "local" material of any sort may reveal have a very broad significance. In this respect academic history is not different from economic history or the history of religion. The records of a local business firm, or of a local church, may hold some interest in terms of the particular community of which they are a part. But they are more apt to be prized for the light they throw on how an enterprise or how a religious congregation conducted itself at a certain period of time in America. And it is precisely this sort of significance which is the most important one, in all probability, for the files of most academic institutions. In summary, any university archive is an archive of at least national scope, and in two different ways—first, because of its incoming letters, which actually document the history of geographically distant people and institutions; second, because of the broader illustrative significance of material which may seem, at first, to be merely local material. Now, of course, in practice all this will depend on the richness of holdings of an archive. But even a new archive, beginning with nothing, will soon have material in it of this potentially broader significance. In fact, it is almost inevitable, for American universities are going to be extremely interesting institutions in the late

twentieth century, and not all the excitement is going to escape being set down on paper. Any institution, new or old, is going to be part of this American academic landscape of the late twentieth century. Fifty or a hundred years later, the "local" significance of the material saved in a new archive may have vanished, along with the last survivors who can remember the individuals involved. But these "local" records are the stuff of which national social and institutional history is later constructed.

This brings us to a final point suggested by the research I did in the history of the American university in its formative period. Each university archive is a gold mine for the histories of other academic institutions and is deserving of a national rather than local conception of its role, regardless of how young an archive it is. In addition, the value of university archives for research in intellectual history--the history of ideas--as distinct from the history of institutions should be emphasized. Here, of course, interest centers on the collections of the papers of prominent professors housed in archives. Although the late nineteenth century was a period when it was easy to get a speech published in pamphlet form if you were a professor, since printing costs were cheap, it is surprising how many speeches--some in typescript and some in longhand--from that time one encounters in archive collections which were probably never published in any form. For the natural scientists and the social scientists, especially, these unpublished speeches, which exist only in the archives, are of great value for the historian of ideas. For example, the papers of Thomas C. Chamberlin are at the University of Chicago. An astronomer and geologist, Chamberlin had an extremely keen mind and gave many addresses, a number of which were not published, in such areas as the relations between science and religion. It is only thanks to the archive at the University of Chicago that the philosophical observations of this unusually important and alert figure in the natural science of his day have been preserved. Then, too, one finds a good deal of material relevant to the history of ideas in letters as well as speeches. All in all, the university archives, when they preserve faculty papers as well as presidential and official files, are major repositories of source material in American intellectual history. As this fact becomes more apparent, the use of the archives from this point of view is bound to increase.

Here a practical suggestion or two should be interposed. The first is a rather general one, namely that a university archivist should be especially active in soliciting materials--personal papers--from the academic faculty, as distinct from the official record-keeping organizations in the university. These need not be the papers of well-known or famous professors. One of the most important gaps I sensed in visiting archives was in precisely this area, particularly

for professors of the late nineteenth century. Only at Harvard, and to a lesser extent at Yale, Columbia, Cornell, Wisconsin, and Chicago, are the materials truly rich in this area. It is too late to do much about the late nineteenth century in this respect, but many of the most interesting American professors are still very much alive today, either teaching or in retirement, and they should be encouraged to turn over papers to the archives. The late twentieth century, into which we are moving, is going to be regarded as one of the richest and most fascinating periods of American history, and in particular of American intellectual history. It is not too late to begin capturing and preserving a record of the life of the mind as it goes on in the universities of this period. Nor is it only a few very well-known faculty people whose papers—that is, personal correspondence, speeches, and so on—are worth preserving. We need a sense of the average as well as a record of the great and the unusual. Fifty and a hundred years from now, historians will want to know what it was like to have been a professor in late twentieth-century America. They will want to know what professors did and what they thought, in not just one but every conceivable academic discipline. It may seem a bit far-fetched, but just as at Harvard, every professor who is given a tenure position at a university should be contacted by the archivist, at the time he is given tenure, and urged to donate his papers to the university archive, either upon retirement or in his will. Meantime, if that has not been done, and there is a backlog of living professors of all ages who have not been contacted by the archivist for this purpose, these people should be appealed to systematically. Of course a professor has every right to destroy his personal papers. But enough men will doubtless be willing to donate them, perhaps after preliminary weeding, to make the archives far richer than they now seem to be in this kind of material.

In answer to this suggestion, it may be objected that facilities are not available for housing and maintaining the papers of large numbers of professors, which would multiply enormously as the years passed. To this sort of objection I can only reply that the storage problem is a physical one which falls outside the scope of my remarks (And microfilm works wonders, of course.). It can only be stressed that it would be greatly desirable to get such a large-scale program under way, within the limits of whatever means are available. It is the papers of professors which will, without a doubt, be given the highest value by the scholars who make use of archives during the decades to come. This is not just because the men who will use the archives and write the histories are themselves professors, and so have a biased inclination in that direction. Instead it is because of the basic fact that academic institutions are far more similar to each other than are academic disciplines. Therefore,

although the official files and papers which record the progress of an institution are extremely important, there does ultimately tend to be a sameness about them which will make them relatively less interesting a hundred years from now. Of course, the official files of an institution should be preserved in the archive. And these files, with their value for the administrative history of that institution, have an importance which far transcends the level of merely local history. But these official files, from president, dean, and regents or trustees, will ultimately have far less that is distinctive, original, imaginative, and exciting in them, than will a similar amount of cubic space devoted to professors' papers. And, furthermore, in practical terms, the official files are usually easy to get. Indeed, at a few institutions one faintly begins to suspect that the archive has been made little more than a kind of attended storage vault for such materials.

For these reasons, it is urged that archivists go about actively seeking to balance collections with the papers of professors, in as wide a variety of the disciplines as possible. For it may be well argued that the highest function of a university archive is to attempt to preserve as full a record as possible of the thinking that has gone on at a particular campus. This means a record of the thinking of professors, in the natural sciences, the humanities, and the social sciences. It also means a record of the thinking of administrative figures about the nature and role of the institution they superintend. Because the academic disciplines are more varied, one from another, and because their thinking tends to be more abstract, a record of academic thought will be given the highest degree of attention a half century or a century from now. And this record of academic thought will be most of all a professorial record. It is here where a better job could be done by the university archives than is now being done at most campuses.

Soliciting the papers of the faculty on a large scale is one important way of correcting this imbalance. There are other ways too. One is by making a better effort to gather the published speeches and articles of local faculty members, as part of an archival undertaking. Very often when such speeches appear in obscure or unlikely places, they are going to be overlooked later. This is one rather easy means of expanding the archive's holdings in the area of professorial thought. All members of the local faculty might be asked to send one reprint of each of their publications to the university archive as a regular matter of policy, to be enforced by frequent reminders, and excepting only major books which are easily accessible in a library. Also, the equivalent of a local oral history project devoted to professors should be started. Now that tape is so easy to use and to store, there is every reason to collect academic thought in this form. Here, of course, a problem presents itself concerning the selection of a

willing and able interviewer. Because many archivists would not feel themselves qualified to do the interviewing, and because most professors might find it difficult outside their own disciplines, this program may be difficult to launch. But if there is anyone available in a particular discipline who will interview some of his colleagues, the result may repay all the labors involved. Indeed, one could picture a kind of forum, or group discussion, participated in by all the members of a department at a particular institution. In such a discussion, recorded by tape, the department members could engage in a free appraisal of the state of their own discipline, and even (if there were a sufficient atmosphere of trust) an appraisal of their own university! In this last connection, though, perhaps the results would be more honest and more comprehensive if such a group were to appraise other universities and simply skip over their own!

These, then, are a few specific ideas about how one might try to correct the existing overbalance in most university archives in favor of administrative materials, and instead center the archive to a larger extent on faculty materials. But we should be less concerned with the techniques than with the basic point that it is the worth of the archive for intellectual history, primarily for the history of the various academic disciplines, which is going to be the most permanent worth of any university archive. If the university presidents of our own day were commanding figures such as Charles W. Eliot or Woodrow Wilson, this judgment might be less confidently rendered. But, as things go, there appears to be no doubt that the faculty as a group will seem far more interesting than academic administrators as a group, when both are glimpsed in retrospect a hundred years from now. Furthermore, the materials dealing with the various academic disciplines will contain far more excitement per pound, so to speak, than materials dealing with the pyramid of academic bureaucracy.

The various observations and suggestions made up to this point stem from my particular experiences as a researcher, visiting archives in order to gather material for a dissertation. During this experience, however, I learned something about the universities' history and also about twentieth-century American university archives. Therefore, let me present a direct view of university archives, at least as they struck one scholar not too long ago.

When traveling from archive to archive in 1960, usually spending somewhere between one and three weeks working in each, it was possible to compare the archives of the major institutions. The requirements of my research were essentially the same everywhere, so as I kept posing the same questions and demands I could not help noting variations in the way these demands were met. Now, of course, I was treated courteously almost everywhere, and in most cases the archival staff went out of its way to be of help. So I do not mean

variations at that level. But there were fairly well-marked variations in terms of what might be called the style and atmosphere of a university archive. In fact, when my trip was finished I felt that the archives in which I had worked could be classified into three basic types, each quite different from the others. The first type could be called the "old shoe" archive, an archive with a well-worn, comfortable, traditional flavor, where nothing is too tidy and yet everything fits and is easily accessible. The "old shoe" archive is usually run by one person who gives it a strong sense of individual dedication and direction and who has been around for a long time, and knows many of the professors, perhaps even the presidents, from personal contact. This person knows from memory where everything is located and, not only that, has a fairly pronounced idea of how much use it has. Stepping into this kind of archive, one has the feeling of entering into the archivist's own domain—a domain that is almost personal in its character. The archivist has brought this world into being and, perhaps even a bit jealously, stands guard over it, maintaining its integrity against the sense of intrusion. Usually such an archivist has a deep sense of loyalty to the institution.

In contrast to the "old shoe" archive, the second type of archive was marvelously well appointed. The "old shoe" archive had usually been down at the heels; not the second kind, though, which is peculiar to the East Coast, so far as I know, and which might be called the "Ivy League" archive. Here the custodianship of documents has been associated with a literary quality of prestige. The archive is arranged with what might be called an Anglican air of formality. Whereas the "old shoe" archive had been an almost private world, reflecting the personal knowledge and will of the archivist, the "Ivy League" archive was a public domain, a world of portraits and portfolios on open display. Here the constant effort seemed to be to make a certain impression. In the "old shoe" archive the visiting scholar had once in a while threatened harshly to intrude into the archivist's daydreams, but in the "Ivy League" archive the danger was rather that a visiting scholar might in effect regard the contents of the display cases with an ungentlemanly seriousness.

There was, however, a third kind of archival atmosphere, one probably more common than either of the first two. This was what could be called the spirit of the "professional" or "bureaucratic" archive. In the "professional" archive, service is rendered in an impersonal manner to all alike. Files and indexes and coding systems abound. Precision and classification are the watchwords. The archivist is neither a one-man ruler nor a litterateur, but rather an official with certain stated public duties and responsibilities.

These are the three types of archival atmospheres I detected, however, practically no archive partook exclusively of only one set of

characteristics as I have described them. These three types represent tendencies only. For instance, to name only the Harvard archive, whose excellence is so proverbial, one finds at Harvard something of the "Ivy League" sense of dignity and formality, something of the comfortable working atmosphere described as "old shoe," and then, in addition, the best indexing and the best and most elaborate job of classifying materials encountered anywhere on my journey. These last traits are the hallmarks of the "bureaucratic" or "professional" attitude. And most of the other major archives would similarly provide a blend of characteristics, although a bit less strikingly.

Still, these can be recognized as definite types of atmosphere, possibly in libraries as a whole as well as in archives. Which, then, if he had any choice in the matter, would the scholar prefer? Would he find his needs better served by the "old shoe" archive, or by the more genteel one, or finally by the "bureaucratic" one? Emotionally, on first reaction, many scholars would opt for the "old shoe" atmosphere of informality and traditionalism. Bureaucracy is a bad word, and nobody is supposed to like it. But actually, as one thinks the matter over, one begins strongly to suspect that the ideal archive, from the scholar's point of view, might lie about halfway along the spectrum from the patriarchal to the "professional." One certainly does want the respect for efficiency, the sense for arrangement, the careful cataloging, and so on, which are rightly identified with a professional attitude of responsibility. A filing cabinet is better than an archivist's memory, even if the archivist has been around for several decades. Yet on the other hand one also wants the ready knowledgeability about contents, the "feel" for substance, the familiarity with the local scene, and the willingness to cut some corners occasionally on matters of procedure, in order to speed things up reasonably—all of these qualities being identified with what has been labeled the "old shoe" archive. Perhaps, then, halfway in between these imaginary polar opposites one might get the virtues of both and the liabilities of neither. At any rate, it is this sort of blend which most scholars would appreciate.

And this brings me directly to the final point. What does the scholar really want from an archive? How does an archive look to the scholar who is interested in working with its materials? The scholar appears to want two things—first, and more than anything else, efficient working conditions; second, a minimal sense, at least, of warmth and sympathetic helpfulness. But let us try to make the scholar's needs a bit more vivid by picturing the life of such a scholar, for instance a graduate student working on his dissertation, as he goes on a research trip which may include university archives.

For the younger scholar, unless he has private means or unusual foundation support, the matter of his budget while on the research

trip becomes all important. The most important single item in his budget is the length of time necessary for the trip. This is time spent away from home, and, unless he has friends to stay with in the city where the research is being done, every day spent in an archive means another night's hotel bill. This rather primitive economic motive lies behind the mood of frenzy which can sometimes overtake the young scholar while he is at work in the archive, particularly if he finds far more material to "get through" than he had first imagined. In order to conquer the most material in the least amount of time, the scholar will make all sorts of fine calculations and what seem like petty demands on the archival staff. First of all, unless he is an extremely slow typist, he will certainly want to type his notes while looking through the documents. He will be concerned as to what hours the archive is open. Indeed, he will often do his long distance traveling (from one archive to another) on a weekend, so as not to waste the hours the archive is open. And of course he will expect documents to be delivered to his desk with a rapidity unknown in European archives—simply because he has experienced the efficiency of American libraries and has based his expectations upon this sort of standard.

Bearing all this in mind, you can probably picture the young scholar arriving on a Sunday evening in the city where the archive is located, checking into a cheap hotel or a rooming house or staying with friends, and getting ready perhaps by going over his notes to recall the various collections he already knows about and wishes to see, figuring in advance the most efficient order of business. Upon arriving at the archives the next morning, he will initially examine the working set-up, inquire about typing, and surreptitiously discover whether he must rent a typewriter from a local shop or whether an extra machine from the archive office will be lent to him, as sometimes is the case. Next he will want to make an informal assessment of the archive's holding in the areas of his own interest. At this stage he will be completely dependent on whatever catalogs, indexes, lists, and so on, the archive has been able to maintain, in conjunction, of course, with the archivist's memory. This process of preliminary assessment may take anywhere from a few hours to a day and a half, depending on the complexity of the categories of information that are relevant to the scholar's research. He is anxious to reduce this time to the minimum, so as to get his actual research under way. Here the existence of intelligent indexes and summaries can be of enormous help. Even a bare list of the names of all the correspondents of a man whose papers are in the archive can help greatly. And it is at this point that the "old shoe" sort of familiarity with the materials on the part of the archivist can really save important amounts of time, hence contribute, ironically enough, to the efficiency that one

also associates with the impersonal card file. When this preliminary process is finished, the scholar will have emerged with a concrete idea of his workload at this particular archive. Usually he will have discovered more material than he originally thought would be relevant, and so his sense of anxiety at getting through the boxes as rapidly as possible will have become heightened.

Next, usually with his typewriter, the scholar will set up what amounts to a production line. The documents will lie on one side, the blank note cards on the other. The scholar will become a veritable machine, plowing through boxes of documents, mentally sorting their contents at a rapid pace into relevant pieces onto his cards. He will usually work as if he were somehow possessed by a demon. All scholars seem to agree that the weeks one spends in archival research are a strange interlude in one's life, a unique form of existence never before experienced and perhaps impossible to duplicate in any other way, even by the often equally intense task of doing a bit of scholarly writing. Perhaps the most accurate way to picture the silent scholar who sits with a remote look on his face at one cluttered table in your archive is to think of him as a combine machine whose owner is being paid at piecework rates, yet for whom there are severe penalties if the quality of the ingestion is allowed to become slipshod. The boxes of documents are rows of corn whose extent had been surveyed at the preliminary stage already described. Now they are being uprooted, sent through the machine, the husks thrown back, and the occasional kernels being gathered onto those note cards. At the end of a good day's work the worker stops wearily, noting with satisfaction both the rising pile of note card kernels by his typewriter's side and also the growing heap of husks--a heap which is in his mind's eye only, since the documents with which he has finished have gradually been returned to the archive shelves.

The closing hour of the archive, incidentally, may not be the end of the scholar's working day while on one of these trips. After dinner the day's note cards may be sorted, so that this task will not pile up at the end. Or the evening may be spent in the main library stacks, running down books and pamphlets which were not obtainable in other university libraries along the way. But this is not the uniform after-hour activity. After one of these days spent as a human combine machine in the archives, the normal reaction is to want to see a movie or else go quietly to bed. Still, the odds are that the scholar averages a longer working day, as well as a more arduous one, than does the archivist. The fact is that, while the archivist is following a relatively steady routine, day in and day out, the visiting scholar who sits in the archive is going through what is for him probably a rather rare experience, a peculiarly intense manner of life which he might well find it difficult to sustain for longer than a few weeks or months at a stretch.

All this, then, has been a plea for understanding. The wandering scholar may seem to have an odd glint in his eye as the archivist observes him; he may betray all manner of symptoms of impatience, or he may at times lose the ability to speak coherently with the human beings who happen to be around him, because he has become so thoroughly immersed in the world of the documents. The archivist should be tolerant. More than this, the scholar will be everlastingly grateful to the archivist for all the small and large things which enable the human combine machine to proceed eight hours a day at top rate of speed. Efficiency, together with sympathetic understanding, is what the scholar most of all seeks from a university archive. This brief description of how the archive figures in the scholar's life should make the scholar's sometimes desperate craving for efficiency seem more comprehensible. If the archivist is aware of the strange, speeded up life the scholar is enduring while on his research trip, the archivist may find it possible to greet his sometimes eccentric requests with exactly that sort of sympathetic understanding which is the best known lubricant for these problems, even if it is not a specifically professional one.

An archive exists, then, both for the actual scholar of the present moment and for the potential scholar of a century from now, as best we can visualize him. The present day scholar will always insist that the archivist's primary duty is to posterity, to that imagined scholar of the next century who may find a meaning in the documents which we are unable to perceive. In the meantime, though, the immediate visitor to an archive will be very much involved in the prosaic problem of obtaining maximum poundage of document inspection for a given hotel bill. To cater to the wants of scholarship, the archivist thus has both a lofty obligation and a seemingly prosaic one. Scholarship asks that documents be actively and carefully collected and preserved; it also asks that they be fed on momentary demand into a human assembly line. Fortunately, the existing practices of the eleven university archives with which I am familiar show that both the long-range and the short-range obligations to scholarship, the major task of document preservation and the minor but vital one of providing an atmosphere of efficiency and human sympathy, are indeed mutually compatible. It is not really necessary to sacrifice either goal to achieve the other. For the task of building and maintaining a university archive has already been done most splendidly in the past, and not just once but again and again. For this fact the scholar of all people has the deepest reasons to be grateful.

PAPERS OF THE ALLERTON PARK INSTITUTES

Number One	October 1954 The School Library Supervisor. Chicago, American Library Association, 1956. $2.00.
Number Two	September 1955 Developing the Library's Personnel Program. (Not published.)
Number Three	November 1956 The Nature and Development of the Library Collection. Champaign, Ill., The Illini Union Bookstore, 1957. $2.00.
Number Four	September-October 1957. The Library as a Community Information Center. Champaign, Ill., The Illini Union Bookstore, 1958. $2.00.
Number Five	November 1958 Public Library Service to the Young Adult. (Not published.)
Number Six	November 1959 The Role of Classification in the Modern American Library. Champaign, Ill., The Illini Union Bookstore, 1960. $2.00.
Number Seven	November 1960 Collecting Science Literature for General Reading. Champaign, Ill., The Illini Union Bookstore, 1961. $2.00.
Number Eight	November 1961 The Impact of the Library Services Act: Progress and Potential. Champaign, Ill., The Illini Union Bookstore, 1962. $2.00.

Number Nine

November 1962
Selection and Acquisition Procedures in Medium-Sized and Large Libraries. Champaign, Ill., The Illini Union Bookstore, 1963. $2.00, paper-cover; $3.00, cloth-cover.

Number Ten

November 1963
The School Library Materials Center: Its Resources and Their Utilization. Champaign, Ill., The Illini Union Bookstore, 1964. $2.00, paper-cover; $3.00, cloth-cover.

Number Eleven

November 1964
University Archives. Champaign, Ill., The Illini Union Bookstore, 1965. $2.00, paper-cover; $3.00, cloth-cover.

3 0112 062903338